This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Periaipe

THE

CHRISTIAN

AMBASSADOR

A QUARTERLY REVIEW,

AND

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

EDITED BY

THE REV. C. C. M'KECHNIE.

VOL. V.

London:
PUBLISHED BY W. LISTER, CONFERENCE OFFICES,
SUTTON STREET, COMMERCIAL ROAD, EAST;
ALL BOOKSELLERS; AND MAY BE HAD OF THE PRIMITIVE METHODIST MINISTERS.
PRINTED BY F. H. HURD,
"THE MAGAZINE," 122, MILE END ROAD, EAST.
1867.

Per. 1419 e 300.
5.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
John Warburton	1
Ministerial Probationer's Time, and How to Spend It	17
The Right Use of Wealth	30
John Knox	40
Should Primitive Methodists receive Government aid for their Day Schools?	59
Strauss' New Life of Jesus	67
The Orator	86
Personal Election	93
The Sovereignty of God's Mercy	110
Joseph Sturge	119
Religious Instability	135
Baptism	148
The Nature and Necessity of Regeneration	162
The Concept of Creation	171
Wordsworth's Poetry	177
Dr. Carey	189
The Great Expectation	206
Extremes in Modern Theological Teaching	217
Eternity of Future Punishment	229
The Physical Effects of Alcohol	237
Mutual Forbearance and Forgiveness	250
Government Grants	260
Metaphysical Preaching	268
Pitt, Sheridan, and Fox	279
The Conservatism of Nature; or, Life *versus* Denudation.—No. I.	285
The Two Helpers	293
On Ministerial Ability	304
Government Grants for Day Schools	317
The Prince Consort	332
The Science of Language	352
Mary, the Mother of God	368
Brief Notices of Books	284, 380

THE

CHRISTIAN AMBASSADOR

ART. I.—JOHN WARBURTON.

Mercies of a Covenant God: being an account of some of the Lord's Dealings in Providence and Grace with John Warburton. Minister of the Gospel, Trowbridge. Fourth edition. London: Gadsby, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street.

NEARLY a quarter of a century ago, soon after the Lord had thrust us into the ministry, we chanced to take up in a friend's house a goodly sized volume, bearing the somewhat quaint title of "The Bank of Faith, by William Huntington, S.S." At the time we were burdened with an almost intollerable sense of unfitness for the work in which we were engaged, and furious waves of temptation to flee into retirement dashing in upon our spirits, we felt as if we should perish. We read a few pages of the "Bank of Faith" as we sat in the house of our friend, and such was the strength and comfort their perusal imparted, that we eagerly asked for the loan of the book. We have not seen the work from that day to this; but the recollection of its contents, of the elevated tone of piety which pervaded its pages, and, above all, of the blessing it was made to an agitated and afflicted heart, remain with us to this hour.

The man whose history it relates was one of the religious celebrities of his day. His name is yet had in affectionate remembrance by the section of the Church of Christ of which he was a minister. Like many of the same school of preachers, he was a singularity: combining acute intellectualism with freakish eccentricity, and deep, adoring, self-abasing piety with a narrow and rigid creed, which led him (or we are much mistaken) to regard as blind leaders of the blind all who allowed any freedom to man's will in matters of religion.

The thought remains with us that Huntington was for many years a poor half-starved village shoemaker, somewhere in the south of England, who, soon after being brought to "taste and see

that the Lord is gracious," began to preach the Gospel in the neighbouring hamlets. After a while he removed to London, where he earned a living as a coalheaver. Continuing to preach in and around the huge city, be soon became known as the coalheaving parson, to whom, in course of time, was gathered a large number of admirers, who built him a good chapel and paid him a good salary; so that, although he began his preaching life in the depths of poverty, he ended it in a suburban mansion, with a footman to wait upon him and a carriage and pair to take him to and from his chapel.

An illustration of the oddities in which he indulged may be seen in the title "S.S." which he affixed to his name. He had not, he said, learning enough to gain "LL.D." nor money enough to buy "D.D.," but as a title of some sort was necessary to enable him to rank with the popular preachers of the day, he adopted that of "S.S.," which meant *Sinner Saved*, that being the fittest and most expressive one he could think of.

We have referred to Huntington and his book because the one before us, and its writer, are akin in almost all respects. True, Warburton did not rise so high in the social scale as Huntington, nor does he seem to have possessed such a vein of humour and drollery; but there is in Warburton the same or even more child-like confidence in God, and more adoring love to Jesus, whilst his book is equal or superior to the "Bank of Faith," as a development of the ups and downs, the trials and deliverances of the religious life. As a piece of autobiography, opening out and laying bare the inner life of man, both before and after conversion, we know nothing like it. It is singularly and severely honest. The author tells us of his sins and follies without reserve, and without making the least attempt at excuse or extenuation. No one can read the book without feeling that its writer was willing to be nothing that Christ might be all in all in the estimation of every reader. To the doctrine of the Gospel Warburton was ardently attached. He could not believe in the possibility of saving religion apart from sound doctrine. The theory of many religious writers of the day, that creedal Christianity ought to be shelved, and the spirit and practice of Christianity brought more into the foreground, received unqualified reprehension from his lips and pen. He could see no streams where the fountain did not exist; no sunshine where the sun himself was concealed; no intelligent humanity from which the soul had taken its flight. To have peace, confidence, and hope in God, Warburton must know God in his electing love, the Saviour in his vicarious sacrifice, and the Holy Spirit in his enlightening, regenerating, and adopting mercy. The triune Jehovah, the incarnation of the Eternal Word, the agonies of the garden and of the cross, the resurrection of the Crucified

One, the perpetual advocacy of the Daysman: these, together with those already named, formed the staple of his pulpit addresses; for out of those facts grew the doctrines of true religion, and from the doctrines, or from true faith in them, came the mind that was in Christ—the will and the power to live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present world. We are not required to give our adhesion to all Warburton's doctrinal views that we may approve of their leading principle; therefore we hesitate not to say that if the creeds of the Bible be ignored or kept out of sight, we have nothing upon which a life of holiness can be built; we have but a castle in the air, a house built upon the sand, an *ignus fatuus!*

The book before us is a singularly fascinating one. What a critic said of a celebrated Frenchwoman's letters, may be said of Warburton's "Mercies": we can "scarcely find out the secret of its power." Certainly the book throws a wonderful fascination over the reader; for once begin a perusal of it, and it is next to impossible to lay it down till the word "Finis" is reached, and then (we blush to say it) we are almost angry with the good old man for not telling us more of the Lord's dealings with him. It is not simply the events themselves which charm us; for the "Lord's dealings" with a living celebrity are equally, yea even more wonderful than those which Warburton relates; (and yet we can lay *that* book down without feelings of annoyance); nor is it chiefly in the style in which Warburton tells his stories, for in many respects that is susceptible of much improvement. But there is a vivacity, a simplicity, an honesty, an unction, a power, a something which goes right to the heart, fastening the eye to the page, and thrilling the soul with emotions which we have no desire to repress, and making us wish that the Church of Christ had, as its ministers, more of such tried and afflicted men.

There are one or two unhappy defects in this incomparable narrative which we hope will soon be removed. Mr. J. C. Philpot, an accomplished minister of the body to which Warburton belonged, seems to have had something to do with editing the work before us; for we can scarcely believe that a man of Warburton's limited scholarship could have produced a book so free as this is from defects incident to a writer like Warburton. We are, therefore, surprised that Philpot should have allowed so many expressions and designations to be put into print as the volume before us contains, whose only tendency is to make the friends of the dear old man wish that some other had been used in their place.

For example: he calls himself names which, but for the evident honesty and sincerity which other parts of the book show us the good man possessed, are calculated to foster the supposition that he was at times given to indulge in cant. He calls himself, for in-

stance, a "fool," a "complete fool," an "old fool," a "beast," a "dragon," an "old wretch," a "hypocrite," an "owl," a "blind bat," and a "brat of hell!" Such foul and abusive epithets, applied to one's self, are obviously unbecoming, and can only excite pity for the man who uses them; and although using them in reference to himself no one can indict him for libel for having so used them, we think his better part must have at times reproved him for having classed himself—a chosen vessel, a jewel of the Lord, an heir of God, and joint heir with Christ—with some of the baser parts of the brute creation. But our friends, the hyper Calvinists, are fond of singular paradoxes.

The book also abounds with an expression which, because of its character and the frequency of its use in various forms, goes far towards making the narrative unhealthy and repulsive. "My soul," my "very soul," my "poor soul," meet us on almost every page, and occasionally turn up as often as twice or thrice in a sentence. This almost compels us to think that Warburton, like some unmarried women we have known, lived very much in the region of self-pity, looked upon himself as a deeply-injured man, and wrote his book to elicit the compassion of the tender-hearted and benevolent. And yet the general character of the narrative gives us a different opinion of the man, leading us to believe that he was the soul of honour, uprightness, and independence. The narrative will go down to posterity in company with Huntington's "Bank of Faith," and Bunyan's "Grace Abounding"; let some one, therefore, who has the right, revise its pages and strike out the sickly words to which we have alluded.

Mr. Philpot, to whom we have referred as having had something to do with the book before us, thus touchingly refers to its remarkable subject: "No written words can portray his venerable appearance, as he stood in the pulpit, his expressive countenance, his voice so full and clear, yet possessing a peculiar pathos and feeling which went straight to the heart, as I never heard any other; his simple child-like prayers, so full of honest confession, yet breathing such a spirit of filial confidence; his solemnity of manner and the command which almost every accent of his tongue exercised over the congregation, especially when his own soul was under the recent bedewings and melting influences of the Holy Ghost."

We have taken our pen to give our readers a few choice morsels from this charming compendium of deliverances wrought out by the hand of God for one who fought the good fight for full half a century. It is a book of spiritual wonders. It plainly declares that "there is a God in heaven who revealeth secrets." It shows that poverty, trial, and sorrow may co-exist with filial piety of the highest order. We wish that every tried Christian had a copy within *his reach*; it would often prove a present help in time of need.

We can overlook the points of doctrine which divide the good man and ourselves. We are one with him on the great subject of regeneration, a feeling religion, the sealing of the Holy Spirit, together with His unerring council and undeviating constancy in guarding, delivering, and sanctifying all His adopted children; and we have a sweet hope of meeting him where

> "Names, and sects, and parties fall,
> And Jesus Christ is all in all."

But we must give our readers a taste of the fat things in the book before us. Let us listen to

THE STORY OF WARBURTON'S CONVERSION.—A new church was opened at Bolton in Lancashire, and John was present on the occasion. The text came from the minister's mouth like a two-edged sword. "I really believed," says John, "that he pointed directly at me, for his eyes appeared to look right through me, and I thought I should have dropped into hell. I crept out of the church as if I had stolen something." A week of misery passed over, and John was once more at the church, in the hope of hearing words of comfort. But instead of receiving comfort, he was cut up more and more. Weeks of wretchedness dragged their weary length along, leaving him without a ray of hope. Sometimes he longed for death, and now and then attempted self-destruction. On one of such occasions he says—"I saw as clearly as the sun at noon-day that the law was holy, just, and good; that God had done me no injustice, and that the whole cause of my damnation was in myself. I said a solemn amen to my own damnation, and indeed I did not want a salvation that was dishonouring to so holy and so just a God. I rose up to take a leap into the pool, when—'Who can tell?' sounded in my ears as if a man had called out to me. I made a dead stand, and said, 'What can that be?' The words sounded again and again in my very soul, and something seemed to spring up in my mind and thus interpret them—'Who can tell but God may yet have mercy upon my poor soul? Who can tell but that that poor wretch, John Warburton, may find mercy yet?' This put a stop to my drowning myself." At length he strayed into Mr. Roby's chapel in Cannon Street, Manchester: "At the conclusion of the first hymn, Mr. Roby went to prayer; towards the end of it he dropped a few words which I believed were for nobody but me. He begged God that if there were any present who had come to make a last trial of his mercy, he would show himself to such a one as his God. It was with hard work that I could keep from calling out—'Yes, here is poor lost John Warburton; here I am come to make the last trial.' When Mr. Roby read his text, O the wonder and glory that shone into my soul.

The precious text was—'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive,' &c. O the love, peace, and joy that broke in upon my heart as the words came out of his mouth. I said in my soul, 'What can this mean? Where are my sins? Where is my burden, and the wrath and terror I have had so many months?'" They were clean gone, and for some time Warburton went on his way rejoicing. But he had

CONFLICTS WITH HIS BRETHREN.—The peculiarities of his conversion were such as to lead him to regard it as indicative of sovereign and invincible grace. He had also been so dreadfully handled by the law in his conscience, during the season of conviction, that when delivered from its condemning power he also regarded himself as having been freed from its controlling claims, and to be entirely governed as well as pardoned by the Lord Jesus, so that he boldly affirmed—"The life I live in the flesh is by faith on the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." This brought upon him a sea of trouble from many who, misinterpreting his views, called him a wild Antinomian. "At their prayer meetings," he says, "I was sure to be present, being quite impatient for the time to arrive to meet the children of God, and tell them again the great things God had done for me. But some of them could not bear to see me there, and one of them told me one night that I was deceived, and that he wished I would never come among them again." It is but fair to listen to his defence. "How can I be deceived, said I? I have pardon in my heart. Such sweet words as these flow in upon me: 'Thy sins are all forgiven thee'; 'Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace.' I would not commit a single sin for a thousand worlds, if I could help it, for it is my meat and drink to do the will of my God and Saviour. When I was under the law, I had no obedience, but was full of anger, rebellion, wretchedness. But now, having been delivered from the law, and having the love of Jesus shed abroad in my heart, I can believe in him, obey him, praise him, thank him, adore him night and day. I never knew what it was to hate sin, to love God, and to delight in his ways until his pardoning love was enjoyed in my heart; and this I was sure was my God and my Saviour in my heart obeying the law." He adds—"For nearly twelve months it was little else with my soul but joy and peace, expecting, hoping, desiring that the time would soon come when I should die and be for ever with my Saviour, to see him as he is and be like him."

By-and-bye he was directed to George Street Chapel, Manchester, where Mr. Gadsby had begun to minister the Gospel, and finding in him kindred sentiments and a similar spirit, he threw in his lot amongst his people, and was the first whom Mr. G. baptised in Manchester. We are now called to look at his

PIETY AND POVERTY.—God had a great work for him to do;

and for this purpose he must be made to feel the pinchings of poverty, and to see the wonder-working hand of God in his deliverances. Hence he was often in straitened circumstances. Let him tell us a few: "At this time I had two small children. Trade was very bad, and provisions dear. It was what we called *Barley times.* At the very time my wife was taken in labour we were without a sixpence. What to do for a little money, or where to go and borrow it, I could not tell. I did nothing but cry, 'O Lord what shall I do? Do direct me what to do, and whither to go.' It struck my mind that I would go to the master for whom I worked and ask him to lend me half-a-guinea. When I arrived at the master's house and asked him to do me the favour, he fetched me the half-guinea without either a frown or cross look, for I watched him closely. Then I knew that the Lord had been before me, for he was not in the habit of lending money to his weavers. I saw that it was the Lord's doing. As I was walking down the street from the warehouse, blessing and praising God, I suddenly met, as I was crossing the road, a man whom I knew by sight from having often seen him at the chapel I attended. In passing, he blessed me in the name of the Lord, and held out his hand to shake hands with me. He ran off, leaving me in the middle of the street utterly astounded to find he had left half-a-guinea in my hand. There I stood for some time adoring, praising, and blessing God, and should have stayed longer had not a coachman, who was driving a coach up the street, called me a fool and told me to get out of the road. Upon looking round, I saw, for the first time, that there was a a number of people collected together, to gaze at me, in doubt I dare say whether I had not made my escape from a mad-house." Again. His home was a cellar, and the landlord began to want him out. "Now indeed, thought I, it is all over with me. There are £4 due for rent, and not fourpence in the world have I towards paying it. But the greatest trial of all was that God hid his face from me. I tried every possible way to get the money, but all in vain. A day or two after this I finished the work I had in the loom and carried it home to my master. As I was coming out of the warehouse, a thought struck me that I would call upon one of the deacons of the church, whose name was Ramsay. I was very kindly received: 'Never fear, John,' said he, 'your goods will not be sold; Mr. Clegg has got the money for you, and has been expecting you to call upon him.' I went to Mr. Clegg. The old gentleman gave me the money; and we both wept together for joy. I got out of town some way or other, but how I knew not, for I had such a weight of glory to carry that at times I had to put my hand upon my mouth until I got into the fields, and then I gave vent to body and soul, sometimes dancing and shouting his praises, sometimes on my knees blessing and thanking him. I called him

all the endearing names my soul could think of, or my tongue utter; and such glorious views I had of the glory of God, both in providence and grace, that I was so lost at times that I did not know where I was or whither I was going."

Another instance is worth recording:—"One Saturday I was all confusion, for I could not get a text, and I had to supply on the Lord's day for Mr. Gadsby. O, thinks I, what shall I do, and where shall I go? To finish up my misery, late on Saturday night I received a note from a man to whom I owed £2 10s., saying that if I did not pay it on the Monday following he would not wait any longer, and that it would be in vain for me to come and beg for any longer time. O what a tremendous night I had to pass through, sometimes almost in despair. I left home on the Lord's day for Manchester. If ever I did pray in my life I prayed those five miles that God would appear for me that day both in providence and in grace. When I began to preach, the £2 10s. were all taken away, and I do believe that the Lord was with me. As I was going out of the chapel, an old lady put out her hand to shake hands, and left half-a-guinea in my hand. O, thinks I, who can tell but God may put it into the hearts of whom he will to give me the rest." Going into the vestry after the afternoon service, the old lady who had befriended him in the morning was there. She shook hands with him, and said, "Sir, when I got home my heart smote me as David's heart smote him." My heart trembled. Surely, thought I, she has come for the half-guinea back again. What shall I do? But instead of this, the old lady said, 'My heart smote me because I did not give you more, and I will now give you £2 more.' At which I burst into a flood of tears, for I could not help it." He told her all his troubles, at which the old lady cried too, and would fain have had him take the contents of her purse, amounting to ten or twelve pounds, but honest John would not take more than he needed for present wants, observing—"God has put it in your heart to give me the debt, and sixpence over, and I dare not take one penny more, and will not. What God moved you to give is mine; the rest is yours."

With instances such as these the book before us abounds; but giving these as specimens we now present our readers with our friend's

CALL TO THE MINISTRY.—The first moving of God in his soul for the work of the ministry was when he was baptised by "that dear man of God," W. Gadsby. At the close of the ceremony, Mr. G. begged God to raise John up as an instrument in his hands for his own glory and the cause of truth. "I believed and felt in my very soul," he says, "whilst in the water, that God heard and answered every word that flowed out of his (Mr. Gadsby's) mouth,

and my soul was so swallowed up in glory that I did not know whether I was in the body or out of the body. After this, I was not like the same man. I had no rest nor peace but in reading, searching, and praying over the word of God at every opportunity. O what a spirit of prayer I felt that God would open my understanding to understand the Scriptures, and how many times did those blessed words of David come into my soul with power, 'Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.' I felt such wrestling at times with God that he would show me the meaning of his blessed word, that both body and soul have been quite weak and feeble, and sometimes such light would shine and flow into my heart from a text of Scripture that it set my very soul all on a flame of love to God and his people. But alas! when I looked at my situation in providence, with hardly a shoe to my foot, with a large family of little children, over head and ears in debt, many times with not half a bellyfull of victuals, without any human learning, except just enough to read some parts of the Bible, and hardly able to write my own name properly, 'good Lord,' cried I, 'what can I be at?' Surely I must be mad to think of preaching, such a fool as I. Then I determined to trouble my head no more about it, and did all I could to put it out of my thoughts. But it was just like trying to empty a spring, for it flowed into my mind as fast as ever I tried to put it out." After days and nights of deep anguish, interspersed with seasons of enravishing communion with God, in which he felt an unmistakeable drawing out to the ministry, he was appointed to address a public audience. He went at the appointed time, begging of God that he would decide the matter for him. After he had read his text, the fear of man was taken away, and the Lord broke in upon his soul; his mouth was opened, and indeed he had a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. A fortnight afterwards he again held forth the word of life with similar enlargement of heart, God making his message a blessing to the hearers. But although a chosen vessel, a deeply exercised child of God, and one who held communion with heaven beyond his fellows, he seems to have been subject to manifold infirmities; for vanity began to rise in his heart, and he found himself at times looking forward to a period when he should occupy a commanding place in the religious world. The story of the workings of pride within him, and of the way which God took to check or destroy it, forms the most remarkable piece of autobiography we ever read. Few men, we think, ever had the honesty to relate anything like the following, nor would they wish it to be told after their death:—"After concluding, I overheard some of the people whispering how well I had preached, and they had no doubt I should be a very great preacher, and one of them whispered to another that he was sure I should be a second Gadsby. O how

sweet this was to my old man! How it gratified him to the very heart! Poor fool! I was carried away with pride to such a degree that I blush to write the thousandeth part of it. All the way home, I was carried away with my greatness, and what I was likely to be, that at times I hardly knew whether I was upon my feet or my head. Sometimes I wondered in what place I should be settled. Surely, thought I, it must be in some great town or other; it will be in London. Before I went again the third time, I actually went to Manchester to see Mr. Mouncey, the acting deacon, with a pretence to tell him that I could not come and preach any more, on purpose to draw it out of him whether he thought I was likely to be a great man. When I arrived at his warehouse, there was another deacon with him. They were both very glad to see me. I told them I was come to inform them that I could not attempt to speak any more, for I was such a blind fool that it would be madness in me to attempt it. And I tried to put on as miserable a countenance as I could, while relating my lying cant, and tried with all my might to squeeze out some tears. The two deacons, believing that I was an honest lad, and that the devil was tempting me to give up the work, encouraged me to go on, and spoke very freely how well they were satisfied, and how confident they were that God had a work for me to do. But I told them I was certain they would never speak to me in that way if they knew my unfitness, and sure I am if they had known my abominable hypocrisy they would have kicked me out of the warehouse, and served me right too. But God knew how to manage me better." The time arrived when he had to preach again. He had sought to get into some dark text, the better to show his skill, but in vain; so he had to be content with an old one, which opened so clearly, and yielded such grand thoughts, that he said within himself, "When I come to preach of these things they will be quite astonished." He found a house full of people, and Mr. Mouncey, the deacon, was present. His hymn was given out with boldness, and in prayer he had liberty. He gave out his text, and then, says he, "for five or ten minutes I tried to say something, but what I said the Lord knows; I cannot tell a word of it. All my pride and presumption, my hypocrisy and lies stared me in the face, and stopped my mouth completely. I dropped on my seat, and verily thought that God would have struck me dead, and sent me to hell as I so richly deserved. I had something else to do now than to wonder where so great a man as I was to be settled. O the miserable journey I had home that night! I was determined to go there and then and try to get on board a man-of-war, and leave wife and children and all." He set off, was arrested by a verse of a hymn, and returned home. "No tongue can tell what I underwent night and day for four weeks. Sometimes I felt as if my senses were entirely gone, and

at last, through the dreadful feelings of my mind, and the fears that if ever I should attempt to preach again the Lord would consume me in a moment, I lifted up my hands and said I would never preach again." Horror now seized him, and for a time he felt as if he was abandoned of God. But at length the Lord "turned his captivity as the rivers of the south." "Casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you," was spoken to his stricken soul by the Comforter, and at once all was light and liberty and life. "The snare was broken, and I escaped," says John. The next point of interest is

HIS SETTLEMENT.—Bury, in Lancashire, was the first place at which he preached (receiving 4s. a-week for his services); afterwards he supplied at Pool Moor, in Yorkshire, where he hoped to settle, but God would not let him. There are few more touching incidents than the one he relates in reference to his Pool Moor disappointment. Then he took charge of a rising cause at Rochdale, where the Lord so prospered him that a commodious chapel was built. But at last, after many ups and downs, he received a call from Trowbridge, which he accepted; and there, after forty-two years of hard and faithful labour, he ended his singular career.

HE TURNS FARMER.—A story of another sort may not be without its practical use to the reader:—Truly man in his best estate is altogether vanity. Warburton had been some time settled at Trowbridge, as pastor of a Baptist church, receiving £150 a-year, when his family increasing in number, and, to use his own homely language, "their mouths, backs, bellies, and feet all growing larger," and feeling that he was sinking fast in his funds, he thought he would turn farmer, and thereby add to his income. Accordingly he took a good-sized house, about a mile from the town, with garden and orchard attached, and convenience to keep pigs and cows. He planted potatoes and other things needful for a family, and bought a lot of pigs. His hopes, poor fellow, were sanguine that the pigs and potatoes, the cabbages and apples, which were growing around him, would soon wipe off his debts, and surround him with plenty; but alas! anon all his expectations were brought down; "for I soon found," he says, "I must turn my live stock into money, or else I should be in the wrong place. But when I offered the pigs for sale, I was told that pigs were so cheap that I should get very little for them, and I was advised to put them up and fatten them. So off I went to the mealman, and agreed to have as much barley-meal as would fat nine or ten pigs. My wife told me, as soon as ever I began to fat them, that she believed fat pigs would come down in price as fast as poor ones; and true enough it was the case, for when I had killed and finished them all up, they did not bring in a third part of what I had calculated upon. As to the crop of potatoes, which I had planted

in the orchard, and which I had expected would amount to upwards of twenty sacks, they rotted in the ground; and as to the apples, which I had calculated would pay half the rent, I believe I had not five shillings worth altogether! Nay, it appeared that the Lord had gone against me, and blasted every plan; and when I came to look over my accounts, I found that coming to this place, with all things connected with it, had sunk me nearly £40 in debt more than I was before I went there. I did really think God had given me up to horrid presumption; and how I hobbled through with my preaching for several months God only knows, for I cannot tell. Sometimes, on a Saturday, I thought I should go mad, for I could get no text. I remember one Saturday the pigs had been in the garden, and I had driven them out, not in the best of tempers, and, as I thought, fastened them in so completely that I considered it would be impossible for them to break out again; but in about two hours, as I was got a little calm, and was attempting to pray for a text, tidings were brought that the pigs were in the garden! O, thinks I, the very devil must be in the swine; and I believe he was not very far from them when I got near them, for the devil was very strong in me, and it was a wonder I was kept from swearing, for I verily believe never did a poor blasphemous wretch come out with more oaths outwardly than I felt inwardly. When I had got them secured in their house again, and got into my room, O the terror that seized my poor mind for the feelings I had had; O how I hung down my poor head, and wished I had never been born!" At length a way was opened for his quitting his farm; the sun of righteousness arose upon him with healing in his wings; he saw more clearly than ever, that as he was called to preach the Gospel he must live of the Gospel. Trusting God, his way opened for the payment of his debts, and by-and-bye we hear him saying, "O the blessedness when God helps us to cease from our own wisdom, and leave our cares in the hands of a covenant God, who ever was, ever is, and ever will be faithful to his promise! And so I found it in this case, for God brought me by a way that I knew not, and made darkness light before me, and crooked things straight, so that my soul leaped for joy. Some of the members of the church, unknown to me, collected more than £20. I was not long in distributing the money, and this encouraged me to cry on to the Lord, for I had a ten pound debt at one place that was coming due, which I must pay somehow or other, but how I could not tell. But my eyes were up to the Lord, and O how sweet the dear promises flowed into my soul, and I found them very good and precious; for let the devil come in on what side he pleased, God sent me a promise that he would provide; and so I found in the morning, for the postman came to the door with a letter from my dear friend, Mr. Gadsby, which

I was not long in opening, and the first thing I saw was a ten pound note. Up into my bed-room I ran, and fell upon my bed, blessing and praising God till my strength of body and soul seemed to be gone. I clasped the Lord's feet with my feelings, and washed them with tears of joy. Such displays of God's wonderful love and goodness may be felt but can never be told."

FAULT-FINDING.—We now turn to a story of another class, exhibiting Warburton's character in another aspect. We have at times wondered how persons believing in their eternal election, and in the Divine call and appointment of their pastors, can behave towards them as they often do. Not unseldom have we pitied the ministers of country churches, when their flocks have sought to drive them from their midst, and wondered how they could resort to such cruel methods to effect their purpose as they did; and have felt glad that we belonged to a system which precludes the adoption of such unchristian means. The great and good Gadsby had several divisions in his church during his life-time, one of which so afflicted him that for weeks he was confined to bed, and the last evidently hastened his death. The holy Warburton was no stranger to this crushing trial. He tells, in a way which almost brings tears to our eyes as we read it, the story of a left-handed attempt to drive him from Trowbridge. Was ever man so candid and humble in telling a history of the kind as is the subject of our sketch? Let us hear him:—"Some began to perceive there was a very great deficiency in my ministry, for want of variety; that when they heard me a few times they had heard all I had to say, and they were confident that my preaching would never keep up a congregation to maintain my expensive family.* I believe they hoped that this might be the case. Some of the people said, 'He comes with a fresh text, but we have the substance of the same things over and over again,' which was perfectly true, for let the text be whatever it might, I was sure to be on the old spot. I could not help smiling one morning when one of our members came into our house and told me that he was come to open his mind to me, for he had been in a very confused dark state for a long time, and the more he came to

* We opine a want of variety is a common characteristic of preachers of this school. To satisfy their hearers they must generally, if not always, place before them certain favourite topics; doctrine and experience must be the staple of their pulpit orations. Books and learning are at a discount, for when poor Warburton once asked a wealthy hearer to aid him in getting Dr. Gill's Commentary, the hearer curtly said: "If I want to know what Dr. Gill says I can see for myself; ask the Lord to teach you." And we more than suspect that pulpit preparation of a certain kind, as written or got off sermons, is forbidden. How is it possible then, for men such as Warburton to give their hearers even tolerable variety? Men of genius, like Gadsby, or of learning and fluency, like Philpot, are not met with any day.

the chapel the harder and darker he was, for it appeared to him, and many more, that my preaching was nothing but one thing over and over again, till he was quite sick and tired of it. I told him I was sick and tired of it many times myself, but what was I to do? I told him I would get into fresh things if I could, and I added, if he could put me into the way how to get into the meaning of some dark passages of Scripture I should be very glad if he would. He got quite out of temper, and told me I ought to get into the parables, and come to the people with some fresh things. O how the devil set upon me when he left the house! He represented to me that my stay at Trowbridge was short, that the people were nearly wearied out, and that my preaching was nothing at all. I tried to get into the parables, and was determined I would pray, read, and meditate till I could bring something fresh and new to the people, and feed them with knowledge and understanding; and I went on reading and praying, and trying to meditate, but I could neither see nor feel anything to meditate on except plenty of devilishness within. * * * O the groans and bitter sighs that did heave up from the very bottom of my heart. But late on the Saturday night, when my poor soul was sinking into black despair, without one gleam of hope, these words came from the King of kings, 'I will lead the blind by a way they know not; I will lead them in paths they have not known. I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do, and not forsake them.' O, I cried, 'Lord, it is enough, it is enough.' * * * I went to the chapel the following morning with my very soul hanging upon the Lord like a child, and, bless the Lord! I was helped to find out many poor helpless, despairing, blind wretches that were just in the very spot where I had been, who came out of their holes like worms, and showed themselves men." This seems to have been a turning point in the history of the Church. Prosperity dawned upon it; and we do not read afterwards of any complaint about the pastor's preaching. Several who had left came back. The debt upon the premises was much reduced, and the church and congregation were greatly enlarged.

JACOB-LIKE PRAYING.—It seems to us that there were at times some discrepancy between Mr. Warburton's belief and practice. According to the creed of the school of theologians to which he belonged, God has "foreordained whatsoever comes to pass;" * thus cutting off every contingency in things human and divine. This necessarily leads them to pray for everything they need or desire in absolute submission to God. The Methodists, and others, on the other hand, believing that God has suspended many of his

* Gadsby's Works, vol. II., page 62.

promised blessings on the obedience of his children, endeavour to exercise faith in the promises while they pray, and when they find it difficult to do so, they pray for an increase of faith, using, meanwhile, the measure they possess that they may secure the measure they need, and, through it, the blessing for which they have approached the throne of grace. Now we are greatly mistaken, indeed, if this practice of piety is not disowned by our Calvinian brethren. We have no wish to pursue the question before us metaphysically, for we know the fog into which it would lead us; but the lowly learner in Christ's school sees the command to pray, and the promise that is annexed thereto. These are sufficient for him: upon his knees he falls, and fixing his faith's eye upon the passage, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer believing ye shall receive," he prays till he prevails. Thus it was at times with Mr. Warburton, albeit his creed forbade it. He was oppressed with a sense of need; he knew the power of prayer; and forgetting "decrees" and "fixed purposes," and remembering only the promise of his Saviour, he wrestled till the blessing was granted him. No Methodist Christian can tell a better tale than the following:—One day, before he began to preach, he was in sore trials in providence, and his wife, who had then a sucking child, had been a long time without food. While getting ready a meal, Mrs. Warburton dropped down in a severe fit. Poor Warburton was now involved in darkness, which lasted some time; for the fits being repeated, his wife's faculties were impaired, and nothing seemed in store for the poor husband but hardship and poverty. "O what scenes were pictured before my eyes," he says. "O how I sank into the very pit of despair. One night, when I had been to the prayer-meeting, my poor wife's case was so powerfully brought to my soul that I felt it impossible to carry it any longer." He went, therefore, into the middle of a large field, fell upon the ground, and began to wrestle with the Lord. "I could neither stir hand nor foot, and here I lay sighing, crying, and wrestling with the Lord. I begged he would not be angry with me, but I assured him I *could not, must not, would not rise up* (the italics are ours) from that place till he had answered my request. I told him I must either have my request or die on the spot. * * * Here I lay passive in his hands for either life or death, and I said to him if it would be more for his honour to deny me my request and take my soul out of the body, his will be done. But by-and-bye he came with such glory and majesty, that my soul was quite overwhelmed with joy as he spoke the words—'Be it unto thee even as thou wilt.' For a few moments I could neither speak nor stir. My poor soul answered him with humility, 'Lord, my request is that my dear wife shall have no more fits.' He answered, 'It is done as thou hast requested.' My body and soul leaped up as a giant refreshed with new wine. Not one devil was to be found, nor even heard to whisper, for the sun had arisen upon

my poor soul, and they had all gathered themselves together into their dens, and my delighted soul went to her work of praise and love. When I arrived home it was very late, and I found my wife in great distress and fear least something had happened to me; but I told her that all was well and right; 'you will never have another fit, for God has answered my prayers.' It is now between thirty and forty years ago, and she has never had one fit since." We know the explanation which our Calvinian friends would give of this event; but we hesitate not to call it a triumph of faith; an answer to prayer; and to assert, that had not the afflicted petitioner fought this glorious battle that night in the centre of that field, or elsewhere, at some other time, we have no reason to say otherwise than that his wife would have remained a victim to the disease which had overtaken her.

LAST DAYS.—Before he died debt and danger ceased to alarm him; and at the patriarchal age of eighty years, after a pastorate of forty-two years, the good old man fell asleep in Jesus. The story of his death, like that of his life, is told by his son John with circumstantial accuracy and great honesty. Many sweet visits did his Saviour pay him while "languishing into life." Once he said, "O what a blaze and a shout will there be when old John gets to heaven; one that has merited hell a thousand times over, the greatest debtor to mercy and the vilest wretch that ever lived. Bless him, bless him!"

We have read the book before us with unspeakable pleasure, and with no little profit. To transcribe, and in some cases abridge the passages we have given the reader, has been to us a pleasant employment. We are thankful that Warburton was led to give the Church the story of his chequered life. Its literary faults and blemishes are lost in the vast fund of spiritual instruction with which the book abounds, whilst the peculiar doctrines which here and there meet us as we go along, only serve to show that while one can feelingly say, "I the chief of sinners am, but Jesus died for me," it is of comparative little importance whether we place election before or after believing, or whether we have been at the font or into the tank. J. S.

P.S.—Our article on Gadsby, in the last May number of the "*Ambassador*," has been favoured with a review in a Baptist periodical. The reviewer takes objection to one or two points, but the only one which we feel called upon to refer to is that which finds fault with our having said that Mr. Gadsby rejoiced in the oozing up within him of the baser attributes of a depraved nature. We have referred to the part of Mr. Gadsby's works in which the paragraph occurs, and find that while we are right in saying that Mr. Gadsby did have those "oozings up" when old and afflicted, we were wrong in saying that he and others of the same creed regard them as indications of their election. It is the *abhorrence* with which they regard their depravity which they look to as a proof *of their regeneration*. We feel called upon to make this acknowledgment and *correction*.—J. S.

MINISTERIAL PROBATIONER'S TIME, AND HOW TO SPEND IT.

AN ESSAY.*

TIME is a possession of inestimable worth to man.

> "Part with it as with money, sparing; pay
> No moment but in purchase of its worth;
> And what its worth, ask death-beds; they can tell;
> Part with it as with life, reluctant."

Time, like life, is prized most when gone. Leigh Richmond, when dying, said to a brother minister, "Oh if you could see the value of the golden moments now as you will see them when you stand at the rim of the grave and look back, how *earnest* would you be in your work."

"Time," says Professor Craik, "is the only gift or commodity of which every man who lives has just the same share. The passing day is exactly of the same dimensions to each of us, and by no contrivance can anyone of us extend its duration by so much as a minute or a second. It is not like a sum of money, which we can employ in trade and put out to interest, and thereby add to or multiply its amount. Its amount is unalterable. We cannot 'make it breed.' We cannot even keep it by us. Whether we will or no we must spend it, and all our power therefore consists in the manner in which it is spent." Here lies the grand secret of success in moral excellency and intellectual growth. We all have time, but it is the manner of using it that makes the dwarf or the giant, the fool or the philosopher. Time is in a peculiar sense the capital of the minister. He does not stand on a common base with other men. Worldly circumstances and prospects are not of such consideration here as in other spheres of life. The poverty or affluence of the home he has left behind are here set out of view. Whatever we have been formerly, we now stand on common ground. Here we are not recognised as men because we have reached the age of twenty-one. There must be mental training, intellectual growth, literary acquisition, before we reach to manhood. Dr. Beaumont, notwithstanding the advantages of an early liberal education, laboured about twelve years, we are told, with little more than general acceptance, devoting that time to those

* An essay read before the Ministers' Mutual Improvement Association of the Hull District, at Driffield, August 30th, 1866.

preparatory studies which formed the brilliant and burning orator of after days. Wrench says, "Young ministers are not to think the ten or twelve years spent in 'toiling and moiling' is lost time. No, it is the way and the only way to true manhood in this sphere. On entering the ministry we, as it were, start life afresh. Time is our capital, and success depends on the use we make of it. We may expend it wisely or foolishly; we may give our hours for much less than half their worth; or we may seize precious lore and heavenly treasure from 'each moment as it flies.'"

The time to be devoted each day to study we do not attempt with exactness to state. This we think should be regulated somewhat according to the physical constitution and mental aptness of the student. One man sooner than another reaches that weariness of the flesh which much study produces. One has a constitution demanding more attention and nurture than another, forbidding lengthened seclusion and application in the study. But apart from all this, no probationer can as a rule give excessively long days to his books. He is surrounded by so many other urgent duties that his time for study is greatly narrowed. But our heavy press of other duties, so far from inducing despondency, should brace us up with resolution to use well the time we have. Let us consider that the world's most intellectual men have not always been the men who have had most time for intellectual pursuits. Many of the ancient legislators and philosophers, many of the modern statesmen and divines, who have been heavily pressed with other duties, have done as much of other labour as other men, and yet have found enough time for the cultivation of the mind to lift them head and shoulders above their fellows.

We think, however, the probationer should have (constitution permitting) on an average six unbroken hours per day for study. And by a proper systematic division of his time, six hours he may secure. If necessary, he might secure a little more, and in some circumstances he must content himself with something less.

With regard to the spending of time, which is the main part of our subject, we remark, first, that to insure success the probationer should *first lay down a plan.* The importance of this cannot be too emphatically stated. Ranging over books in quest of we know not what, reading without an object and without a purpose, reading books instead of studying subjects, miscellaneous and unsystematic reading, is a course to be condemned as a waste of time, and unfriendly to the proper education of the mind. A man may pursue such a course for fifteen or twenty years, and at the end neither he nor his friends will be able to see that he has acquired mental strength by such a freakish career. He may have very many fragments of knowledge floating on the surface of his mind, but there is no world of living thought grounded in the depth of

his being. His knowledge is too vague and general; he can touch on many things, but can really go into nothing; he has more than half wasted his time in the enervating work of playfully fishing for information instead of earnestly learning to think. Such a character is simply that of a smatterer. Thus even diligence will not secure success unless it be diligence in a right course. For the young student to traverse the field of literature, to go swimingly through scores of books and hundreds of periodicals, instead of thinking over, grappling with and mastering the essential branches of education, is a very grave mistake.

If, therefore, the probationer would become anything more than a mere smatterer, he must lay down a plan, or one must be laid down for him, as is now done by the Conference. The same plan, however, we would remark, cannot be equally adapted to every mind. We think a little latitude should here be given to the student. To secure success, the plan should be as much as possible congenial to his mind. It should correspond with his mental aptitude. But notwithstanding these considerations, the majority of the subjects it must embrace are such as cannot be left to the option of the student, inasmuch as several of them form the groundwork of a common English education, and others are essential to the formation of an efficient Primitive Methodist minister.

The plan should be such as to accomplish most effectually two objects—*the training of the powers of thinking and speaking, and supplying the most desirable information.* We deem mental discipline quite as important to the young student as the acquisition of knowledge. It is not so important to learn how to think as to acquire information about which to think. What would be the use of a man collecting material for the building of a house if he had not the wisdom to make further use of it? Instead of its being formed into an edifice it must remain as heaps of useless lumber. The husbandman may cast abroad his seed, but if the soil is uncultivated his harvest prospects will not be very promising. Now the mind must be taught to think or it will be able to make little use of knowledge; it must be cultivated, its several powers strengthened by application to study, or it will yield a scanty harvest. We ought to strive to increase in wisdom as well as in knowledge, to become intellectual as well as intelligent.

The mind, like the body, gathers strength by strenuous exercise. Take any limb, or the whole body, and put it through a proper course of gymnastics, and how every muscle which is called into action will be strengthened, how athletic the whole body will become, until that which could be done only with difficulty and fatigue can be done with comparative ease; so it is with the mind. Phrenology teaches that there is an organic development by mental exercise; and experience teaches that our intellectual powers

wonderfully strengthen by being properly trained. That subject which now seems very difficult and abstruse may in a few years become easy and clear. A book which seems now quite above our grasp may, after a course of severe mental discipline, unfold its treasures to our view, and we may be able to march through its pages in triumph.

On this point is is worthy of remark, that not *one* power of the mind simply requires training, but the *whole* mind—the mind with all its powers. To foster one power and neglect another is a course which intellectual philosophy condemns. Simply to train the memory and store therein a world of facts and thoughts, whilst no digestion, no assimilation goes on, would be to enlarge it, but only into a sort of huge sepulchral shrine unvisited by a resurrection's power. To make the imagination a sort of pet faculty, bestowing upon it excessive nourishment and care, would be to make it a sort of wild aerial monster, all wing and feather, too light for practical use in a world like this. To bestow all attention on the reasoning faculty even, important as that faculty is, would be to commit a serious mistake. A mind all reason would be a mind cold and dry to most other minds. Thus to discipline one power to the neglect of others is to form an unequal disproportionate mind. The whole mind wants cultivating. No faculty must be allowed to run waste; every power must be developed. Hence the plan of which we speak must be sufficiently broad to include the cultivation of all the intellectual powers.

This discipline is to be secured by subjecting the mind to severe study, by mastering difficulties, by slipping over nothing because it is hard. The student must never yield to the feeling, "I can't do it." Earnest application, nailing down the whole attention to the subject in hand, thoroughly cramming each hour with close thinking, is the sort of training the mind needs. The mind is prone to creep instead of run, to touch subjects instead of grapple with them; whereas its energies and powers being trained and brought out, it acquires a potency and can accomplish an amount of work truly surprising.

Sermonising, we conceive, is an excellent exercise to promote mental culture. By sermonising we mean the student making his own outlines, reading himself up on the subject, thoroughly digesting his acquired thought, and weaving his discourses out of his own brain. Here lies the difference between a pulpit weakling and a true man. "Thought," says an author, "engenders thought. Place one idea upon paper and others will follow it, until you have written a page. You cannot fathom your mind. There is a well of thought there which has no bottom; the more you draw from it the more clear and fruitful it will be. If you neglect to think yourself, and only use other people's thoughts, you will never know

what you are capable of. At first your ideas may come out in lumps, homely and shapeless, but time and perseverance will arrange and polish them. Learn to think and you will learn to write; the more you think the better you will express your ideas."

Logic or mathematics affords excellent discipline, especially for the reasoning powers. Each has its points of preference. The science of logic, besides the mental training it affords, gives an insight into reasoning, and furnishes excellent rules by which to detect fallacies and build up sound arguments. But geometry, whilst it does not profess to furnish such rules, does certainly excel logic as a cultivator of the reasoning faculty, and is thus better calculated to promote in the mind the "intuitive art of logic," which we deem vastly more important than simply a knowledge of rules.

As means of discipline, the classics and mathematics have long taken the lead in all our principal educational institutions, and promise still to hold their position, being quite unlikely to be supplanted by anything worthy of their place. The inquiry is commonly made, "Why should men learn dead languages and geometrical problems which can be of no possible use to them in after life?" To which we cannot reply better than in the language of a contributor to the "Christian Observer," "It is to train their powers of mind, to develope their reasoning faculties, to accustom them to continued application, to teach them close accuracy, to cure them of slovenly ways of thinking and writing."

Classics and mathematics are so adapted to train the whole mind. There is not a power they do not call into action, and not a part of our mental nature they do not cultivate. But however intense may be the desire, however strong the relish of the probationer for these subjects, he can do little more than study their elements. At most he must content himself at present with treading the threshold of this grand old temple of learning, and giving his mental vision mere glimpses of the wealth and glory of the interior. For him to rush up to this high sphere, leaving behind him unmastered the elementary branches of a common English education, would be to waste much time and defeat to a large degree his own intentions.

Before leaving this part of our subject, there are several other important points which properly come within the range of description on which we should like to linger, but time will only allow a passing glance.

Good habits are the result of discipline. The probationer should consider that he is now forming most of his habits as a minister; habits that will to a great degree determine his course through time and materially affect his destiny in eternity. It is of the utmost importance to look to them and form them wisely. Inat-

tention, fickleness of mind, carelessness in thinking and writing, laxity in pulpit preparation, a loose irregular expenditure of time, a spirit of slothfulness and procrastination, and vulgar manners, if yielded to and fostered now will in a few years constitute a part of the man, which no self-discipline, however severe, will succeed in totally sweeping away. Good habits constitute a model man; they are the sterling wealth of a minister, of incomparably greater worth than a mountain of rubies.

A good style is in a great measure the result of discipline, and will to a considerable degree be formed during the period of probation. A simple, lucid, vigorous style is the one best fitted for the pulpit. Johnson says, "Whoever wishes to attain an English style familiar but not coarse, and elegant but not ostentatious, must give his days and nights to the volumes of Addison." But we dare to think that Addison's is not the style for the pulpit of our day; it is too smooth. One more sinewy and strong is needed by the preacher, whose appeals in this age are chiefly addressed to slumbering professors, half-seared consciences, and indurated hearts. In our judgment, the two best books in the English language for forming a style for the pulpit, are the Bible and Shakspere.* Let the young preacher live much amid the grand poetry of the Bible, amid the simple and forcible diction of Evangelists and Apostles; let him frequently read some of the best dramas of Shakspere, together with others of our best English poets, such as Spencer, Milton, Young—read them repeatedly, intelligently, earnestly, and strive to catch the fire of their poetry, and drink in the sweetness and music of their numbers, and thereby his style will be improved, his thought enriched, and an increased brilliancy and glow will be given to the whole of his public ministrations. But let it be distinctly understood that the first and most essential thing to form a clear style is to think clearly. For we labour in vain to make that clear to others which is not clear to ourselves. On this, the first and most indispensable quality of a good style, Quintilian remarks, "Discourse ought always to be obvious, even to the most careless and negligent hearer; so that the sense shall strike his mind as the light of the sun does our eyes, though they are directed towards it. We must study not only that every hearer may

* Some strongly object to the writings of Shakspere on the ground of the coarse sentiments they contain. But it should be remembered the dramatist does not gild vice, but reveals it in its "native ugliness;" so that as revealed by him his readers will be the more likely to loathe it than become bewitched by its charms. Most people admit it to be right, and even important that the preacher should know much of human nature: he finds it most faithfully and skilfully delineated in Shakspere. And there is much of it we would rather learn from the poet than from practical life. However, those who do not feel themselves competent to gather up their robes and walk through Shakspere without being *tarnished,* may find a purged edition published by W. and R. Chambers.

understand us, but that it shall be impossible for him not to understand us."

Elocution claims a passing remark. It has always ranked high amongst human attainments. Among the giant minds of ancient Greece and Rome to be an orator was to be a prince amongst men —it was to occupy the apex of human greatness. Since those ages the art of elocution has much fallen into decay. However, the art combined with nature's gifts is a grand power, and is worthy of considerable attention. But there is perhaps no subject which needs studying with more watchfulness and care. The unassisted tyro is liable to augment his faults and multiply his defects, instead of acquiring that accuracy, grace, and power for which he pants. We have no high opinion of the utility of those works on the subject that are crammed with rules. They may serve a good purpose as used by the elocutionist, but they are not the thing for the private student.

To the student of elocution two things are necessary. 1. The correction of his errors. It would undoubtedly be to his advantage to practice music, and thus cultivate the ear, making it more sensitive to harsh and unnatural sounds. Strict attention must be given to pronunciation, not overlooking the two simple laws of aspiration, the neglect of which is equally discreditable to the speaker and grating to educated ears. Reading aloud is a capital exercise; some passage in Shakspere for example, listening meantime for any unnatural inflection, and putting in that variety of intonation necessary to effect. Much may be learned too from hearing the best speakers; also by eliciting corrections and suggestions from an intelligent and faithful friend. 2. The other thing necessary to the elocutionary student is earnestness. This is the chief secret of the highest elocution, and is indispensable in the pulpit. All the embellishments of art are light and powerless without this. Stolid tameness in handling immortal themes is unbearable; and empty vociferation is still more offensive to good taste. To take physical exertion and free perspiration for earnestness is a fatal error; an error into which some of the unthinking fall. They remind us of the mistaken musician. The Sultan, Abdul Medjid, after listening to the performance of a very energetic French pianist, called the delighted professor to his side, and remarked, "I have heard Thalberg—I have heard Liszt—but of all the men I have heard I have never seen one perspire so much as you do."

The plan, we remarked, should also supply *the most desirable information*. There is so much that the minister ought to know, and so small a portion of it that can be acquired during the short term of probation, that we experience some embarrassment in giving prudent directions. Here is room for difference of opinion. We however venture to state that the plan must contain the fol-

lowing subjects:—arithmetic, English grammar and composition, modern geography, ancient geography of Bible lands, history of England, Methodistic theology, general Biblical knowledge, evidences of Christianity, history of the Church, and homiletics. Such subjects must be known and known well. Indeed, much ought to be known of them before entering the ministry, so that the probationer should simply have to rub himself up on these branches. At a university examination there are subjects which are deemed more important than others, subjects in which candidates must be up, and which form the point on which their passing or plucking turns. We think that the above subjects ought to hold a similar position at the final examinations of our probationers.

But further, we suggest that the plan should include logic or Euclid's first four books, rhetoric, natural theology, ancient history, history of the English language and literature, one of the leading sciences, viz.: astronomy, geology, or chemistry. The phases of the leading forms of heresy and scepticism; and we should like the plan all the better if it recognised one of the classical languages. We hope, however, the number of subjects will not give alarm. It should be observed that a large book on each subject is not needed. The probationer has not time for exhaustive books; those can be reserved for future days. He should have the best elementary book on each subject, and having thoroughly mastered it, he has accomplished a feat over which he may rejoice. His work is not to finish his education but to get well grounded in its first elements—to lay the foundation and then seek to finish the superstructure in after years.

If our plan be too extensive for some who have had but extremely moderate educational advantages in their early days, it is not sufficiently extensive for others whose circumstances have been more favourable. To meet this difficulty we have separated the subjects as above into two classes, distinguishing between that in which the probationer must be well up, and that in which he must have a considerable knowledge.

Having laid down the plan, the next thing is to work it out. To do this the student must be prepared for close and continued application; and he who is not prepared for this by no means deserves the name of student. "There is no royal road to learning." Were we placed in a college and could we even sit at the feet of a Plato or a Gamaliel we should yet be able to conquer only by labour. Sir Isaac Newton was once asked by a high personage by what means he discovered attraction, and his answer was, "By constantly thinking on the subject." This "constantly thinking on the subject" is the key which opens the temple and unlocks the treasury of knowledge. Wirt says, "Take your course wisely but firmly, and

having taken it, hold upon it with heroic resolution, and the Alps and Pyrenees will sink before you. The whole empire of learning will be at your feet." Thus the plan being formed, let the student go to work with all earnestness, nailing his attention down and determining to master everything he undertakes, and he will soon become astonished at the amount of labour he can do.

Immediately after rising in a morning it would be well to employ means to shake off lethargy, brace up the body, and invigorate the mind. It was Benjamin Franklin, we believe, who used to "wash all over" every morning the year round; an excellent practice which many since his day have followed. It would prove helpful to both body and mind to take a short walk whilst herbs and flowers are wet with the dew of night and the cool breezes of early dawn are fanning into higher life the healthful parts of creation; and meantime read and meditate upon nature, and hold deep silent communion with nature's God. And having returned, let the Divine Book be read prayerfully and yet critically, and stir up the gift of devotion within. Thus an impetus may be acquired, enabling the mind to enter upon study with a resolution all but irresistible.

A great deal may be done by using those fragments of time which others throw away. "It is well," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "if some ministers do not spend more time in unnecessary visits and unimportant letter-writing than would be required to learn all the Hebrew and Chaldee of the Old Testament and Greek of the New." How much time is lost, too, by late rising. Now these time-thieves must be watched and manfully resisted if we would make the most of life.

At the table or in the social circle many theories and facts, met with in the course of reading, might be introduced in conversation with pleasure and profit to the company, and with great advantage to the student; impressing facts, dates, &c. on the memory, requiring him to digest what he has read, and training him to express with conciseness and readiness the information he has obtained. The probationer might, whilst going to and from his appointments in the after part of the day,* exercise his thoughts greatly to his profit by reviewing his morning's work, and thus strive when away from his books to tread his ground over again. But if the mind be considerably jaded by close application during the hours of study, and shrink from such exercise, then doubtless it would be to the advantage of both body and mind to indulge in thorough mental relaxation.

But further, the student may gain much time by being systematic in study,—making a proper division of time and taking up

* Our journeys in this District are chiefly along green lanes.

each subject regularly and methodically. Experience tells us that to apportion to each subject its time, and thus earnestly work by rule, will accomplish vastly more than can be done by pursuing a loose disorderly course. The mind must be taught to tread a marked-out path, to bind itself down periodically to certain subjects, to give each its share of attention, and thus keep all that are on hand fresh before it.

And here we would remind the probationer that the best hours of the day, hours when the mind is in its most healthy and active state, should be given to pulpit preparation. For *preaching the Gospel* is emphatically *the* work of the Christian minister. We would further add that this part of his duty should never be approached without first seeking by fervent prayer to be imbued with the Spirit of God. The compositions of the study, born and bathed in a spirit of earnest believing prayer, will be the most likely to prove effectual when delivered from the pulpit.

Again: The student may gain time by being, as Todd says, "thorough in every study." It is helpful to note down in a brief suggestive form the principal points in his reading, and commit them to memory—get them thoroughly into the mind. Extensive use of the pen may be made in studying each subject with great advantage. Bacon says, "Writing makes a correct man." Nothing should be done doubtfully. Not a passage of Scripture should be quoted, a word spelt or pronounced without being certain it is correct. Such a course may be found slow at first, but the accuracy, the confidence, the substantial growth which will be gained thereby will prove an ample remuneration for the time and labour given.

Time is saved, too, by having a frequent change in study. There are few subjects the mind can apply itself to with unabating vigour for more than two hours at a sitting; for some subjects one hour of close application is enough. When the mind begins irresistibly to lag in its course it requires a change. Then to take up another subject is almost equivalent to a rest. To carry out this idea the most effectually, each day should be divided into sections, and each section of time should have its subject and each subject its time. We suggest that the probationer draw up rules for himself on this point, enter them in his pocket-book, and daily mark in his diary his failures (for he will have them—not a few). He will thus become awake to his short-comings and will be furnished with a spur to goad himself on to greater diligence.

But beside a plan for the day, the probationer should have a plan for the year. The subjects placed before him to master in four years seem to him to be a sort of wilderness, which he enters with the fear that he cannot succeed in the given time in exploring. He is thus discouraged and weakened at the very outset. But let his work be divided into sections, and allot to each section its time, and

his courage will rise, and being buoyed up and propelled by that grand and all-conquering feeling, "I can do it," he will commence his work with the head and heart of a hero. The following scheme, portioning out the work for each year, will exemplify our meaning:—

First Year.—Sermonising (theory and practice), Methodistic theology, arithmetic, English grammar, geography of Europe (including mapping), history of England to the death of Richard III.

Second Year.—Sermonising, theology, history of the Church from the beginning of the 16th century, English grammar and composition, universal geography, history of England from the death of Richard III., history of the Jews.

Third Year.—Sermonising, general Biblical knowledge, history of the Church to the end of the 15th century, with special reference to the theology and divines of the first three centuries, natural theology, outlines of ancient history, English language including derivation and prosody, mathematical geography, rhetoric.

Fourth Year.—Sermonising, geography of Bible lands, evidences of Christianity, phases of Scepticism and Heresy, logic or the first four books of Euclid, one of the sciences (astronomy, geology, or chemistry), history of the English language and literature, Latin or Greek.

It would doubtless be of great service to the probationer if he had, together with such a plan, a yearly examination. Now having an examination simply at the end of four years, he does not forcibly feel the pressure, the stimulus which an examination is calculated to give until the greater part of his time has gone. Whereas if he had a yearly examination the prospect would bring upon him a greater amount of propelling influence. Besides, by such annual tests he would repeatedly become awake to his wants, and hence would know better how to bring himself up and meet his principal and final examination with encouraging success.

Without designing to reflect upon any party, we remark that the probationer needs much more help than what as a rule he receives. He needs probing, drilling, and lecturing weekly. And we suggest and urge the desirableness and utility of his seeking an efficient tutor in each station in which he is called to labour, to give him lessons in the secular branches of his course, whilst his Biblical and ecclesiastical studies will be directed exclusively by the tutor appointed by Conference. A few pounds thus expended might yield a large return, not in gold, but in that which is incomparably better, in mental lore and talents increased and brightened for usefulness.

Once more, at the risk of repetition, we urge the probationer to lay down his rules, to draw up his programme, to draw it up wisely, and then determine, "through thick and thin," to work it out.

Thus real and even rapid progress will be insured. "Here," says Dr. Olin, "beyond all doubt resides the great secret of success. Ordinary minds working upon a *plan*—working systematically—achieve what, without such helps, is utterly impossible to the greatest genius. In fact, great intellectual performances are not often the products of minds of the best natural gifts. Such minds are wont to be corrupted by facility of acquisition, and to rely more upon special efforts than upon persevering industry. Science owes its triumphs chiefly to the race of patient, plodding workers, who are content to pay the price of wisdom, and whose steady, life-long progress in knowledge usually leaves behind the whole multitude of competitors, who so easily outstripped them at the beginning of the race."

In conclusion, we will name a few incentives to labour in this field of self-formation and equipment.

Emulation is a propelling force which in itself is natural and therefore good; though when weighed in the scale of morality and philanthropy it will be very light, yet in connection with nobler principles it has its worth. It is inherent in our nature, and no doubt has been planted there for a wise purpose. The apostle Paul recognises it favourably, and even seeks to move it in others. (Rom. ii. 14.) Each probationer may set his mark high and resolve to reach it; he may lawfully and laudably aim at standing foremost at the examination, and excelling his brethren in intelligence and ministerial efficiency.

Ambition, which differs somewhat from emulation, is a fine-spirited steed, runs well, but needs holding with a tight rein; but mounted and properly controlled it will conduct a man over wearisome deserts and up fatiguing mountain sides with advantage to himself. It is natural, and we think quite in harmony with Christianity, for a young man to care about his standing in society, the character he bears and the position he shall win amongst men. Let the young preacher feel that having the germ of true manhood within he will through the blessing of heaven develop and mature it; that he will win a height worthy of being occupied; that he will make his existence felt by society; that the Church shall in him have a son of worth—one valiant for the truth.

We think the above-named passions of our nature might be wrought upon in the probationer to good purpose. If the Conference were to award honours to the most successful students in the higher branches of the course, supposing it were only the printing in the minutes of the Conference the name of the student together with the branch in which he excelled, it would tend to awaken his emulation, to arouse his ambition, to constrain him to more vigorous efforts in his educational career.

A thirst for knowledge is a nobler actuating principle than either *of the preceding.* This when it gets really kindled *is a power.*

It has been so intense in many that they have deprived themselves of all other indulgences, have subjected themselves to extreme self-denial and excessive labour to gratify it. A passion for knowledge has burnt so strongly in some, that it has consumed their lives,—they have sacrificed their existence to it. How strong must it have been in Professor Hyne. For when a youth he allowed himself only two nights a week for sleep during six months, that he might have more time for his favourite pursuit. The love of knowledge for its own sake is, we believe, the strongest incentive to study ever felt by the human mind. Let the probationer experience this in a high degree, and then study will be one of the highest delights of his existence, and his most blissful recreation will be to labour at his books.

Another and yet nobler incentive to self-culture is a desire for usefulness. We hold that every genuine Christian minister has this desire in a high degree—that it is one of his most distinctive characteristics. He being called by heaven to the sacred office, being baptised by the Holy Ghost for the work, and having the love of God abundantly shed abroad in his heart, will have a desire for usefulness like a burning fire in his bones. Jer. xx. 19. This desire is the offspring of deep piety—it is fed by divine truth and close communion with God. And he who has it will be prepared to rise early, to go late to rest, to labour hard all the day that he may train his heart and mind for usefulness. Ardent love for truth and for the souls of men is a principle that will drive the young minister to do anything or everything that lies in his power to qualify himself for his great and solemn work.

But the probationer's principal incentive in his path of self-improvement should be to glorify his God and Saviour. Every other motive must be subordinate to this. This must be the pre-eminent principle — the burning passion of his soul. He should earnestly aim at making everything contribute to the honour of his Divine Master. All his studies should be pressed into service to accomplish this. Here all his efforts should converge to a focus. Seeing this, seeing it in the light of heaven and under the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost, he will be constrained to make the best of his time, diligently to improve his talents, earnestly to prepare for the coming of his Lord; to work for God, to be spiritually minded in all his doings, to make all his studies fragrant with the holy incense of devotion, and to cry from the very depth of his heart, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Thus let the probationer use his time and cultivate his powers with the untiring diligence of one conscious that he must give an account to God; let him make the Bible his daily companion—his constant source of inquiry—his infallible oracle of appeal, and like

the venerable Wesley, be "a man of one book," reading others with an eye to a better understanding of this; let him steep his mind and heart well in Methodistic theology—thoroughly study and zealously spread the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and eagerly aim at treading in the footsteps of his Divine Lord, consecrating his entire life to "doing good," and he will "make full proof of his ministry," will show himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

LINGUA.

ART. III.—THE RIGHT USE OF WEALTH.*

"And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."—Luke xvi. 9.

THE faithless steward did wrong in order to help himself into a temporary and precarious home. We are advised to do right, and to use our property so that it may by righteous and generous appropriation contribute to our enjoyment of a happy and everlasting home. The right use of temporal things, no doubt, has its influence on our future state. Generous deeds will not procure heaven for us, or create a claim to it. That honour belongs to Christ. His atoning death opens the door for us, and the action of the Spirit on our hearts produces in us the moral fitness for heaven. These two doctrines we must adhere to as fundamental and certain. The title to, and meetness for heaven are related to the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit, respectively. Yet when we admit this, there must be a place for good works, which are evidential signs of character. They evidently have some bearing on our future bliss, or we would not hear tell of them so often in relation to it. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." Rev. xiv. 13. Their works follow them for recognition and recompense and honourable mention. "But when thou makest

* A Sermon preached on behalf of the Ladies' Benevolent Society, Flag Lane Chapel, Sunderland.

a feast call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind. And thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke xiv. 13, 14. Here is good assurance that good works will have a future recompense. God knows both how to admit us to heaven for his Son's sake, and to reward all kind deeds that spring from right motive. There are some good deeds entitled to no reward. There are others that are rewarded to the full in this life. But there are others still that either meet no reward till the next life, or are rewarded both here and there. Of this third class we understand the good works recommended in this text. Let us investigate it. We have here,

I. A DESCRIPTION OF WORLDLY WEALTH. "The mammon of unrighteousness." Mammon means *riches*, the word which we find in the margin for explanation. Unrighteousness is commonly equivalent to injustice. Taking it thus, unrighteous mammon will mean unjust wealth. It may well be so called, because it is often unjustly acquired, unjustly expended, and unjustly hoarded up and imprisoned when it ought to be in circulation and use, doing good both for its proprietor and for others. Much sin is committed in relation to money. It is often come at by unworthy means, by fraud and force, and illegal shifts and contrivances. It may be acquired by the merchandise of articles not worth what is paid for them. Or it may be obtained by an exorbitant interest charged on money lent. Or it may be the result of hard labour unpaid or ill-paid, or not paid at the due season. Or it may be amassed by its owner robbing himself for the time being of what his body requires in food and raiment to sustain it in health and comfort and decency. Penurious self-denial in the midst of ample means is an injustice. The same may be said of a man dealing scantily with his family board, and wardrobe, and not allowing his children comfortable maintenance and a fair education. By many such devices which a covetous disposition dictates the purposes of life are frustrated. The Scripture describes several dubious practices and suspicious turns that worldlings are guilty of, and brands them all in clear open terms. It forbids short weights and measures. "Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have; I am the Lord your God." Lev. xix. 36. It brands as a dishonest man the customer who depreciates an article, and by importunity carries it off at less than its real worth. "It is naught, it is naught, saith the buyer; but when he is gone his way, then he boasteth." Pro. xx. 44. It was a bad article, not worth the money asked for it, till he bought it; and on coming into his hands it suddenly rose in its value, and was worth more than he had paid for it. In conscience he ought to go back and pay the full sum he rates it at. The Scripture censures the tricks of corn merchants and those who sell the necessaries of life, keeping their goods out of the market to

fetch an extravagant price. "He that witholdeth corn, the people shall curse him; but blessing shall be upon the head of him that selleth it." Pro. xi. 26. "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit, that we may buy the poor for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat?" Amos viii. 5, 6. There are things done in the market which the Bible will not sanction. It would be well for all men of large means to study what the Scripture says to them as a class, and to keep out of the way of the curse which it pronounces on ill-gotten wealth or its owners, and to get into the way of the blessing it assures to all who follow its directions in the disposal of their wealth. We check quotation. These passages illustrate what we have affirmed—that riches are sometimes acquired by injustice, and for that reason may be called "unrighteous mammon." We will not boldly state that this is the meaning of this passage. By doing so we should offend the generation of commentators who are nearly all set against this explanation on account of the abuse it might minister to. It might countenance money-making by false and fraudulent means and atoning for it by bestowing a large part on charitable and religious institutions, when it ought rather to be restored to its lawful owners. "I, the Lord, love judgment, I hate robbery for burnt offering." Isa. lxi. 8. We must not do evil that good may come. Whether this passage means it or not, it is perfectly true that riches are unrighteous mammon when acquired by unrighteous means.

Another explanation that is relied on as the true sense is—"deceitful riches" or "false riches," as opposed to the true. So the 11th verse, "If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous (or false) mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches?*" Riches can only be deceitful relatively. The unconscious silver, or gold, or other property, is innocent. It is the heart of man coming into contact with those things that is chargeable with the deceit. Rhetorical licence, however, attributes to them the moral qualities which properly belong to their owners. "The care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word" and render it unfruitful. In many ways riches are deceitful. They carry the heart away from better things, and absorb the affections that are due to God alone. But chiefly they cheat expectations. They are not reliable. When you have them you cannot be sure of keeping them. They are so slippery and treacherous that you have no guarantee for their continuance. It is well known that they have wings, and if not closely watched will take advantage when your back is turned, and pass out of sight and out *of reach.* The wise man founds his advice on this very circum-

stance. "Labour not to be rich, cease from thine own wisdom. Wilt thou set thine eyes upon that which is not? For riches certainly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle towards heaven." Prov. xxiii. 4, 5. The accidents to which they are liable are numerous. A flourishing business may be ruined by a successful rival establishing himself in the neighbourhood, by the caprice of the public, or by the dishonesty of agents and servants. A ship worth thousands of pounds is at the mercy of wind and wave, and may be thrown away in a storm. Valuable property is often destroyed by fire. Bankrupts ruin both themselves and others who have dealings with them. A single turn of the wheel of public affairs often involves men of wealth in irreparable losses and sinks them so low that they can never rise again. Wealthy Babylon, the medium and emporium of commerce, has been known to fall. And in one hour so great riches come to nought.

Suppose they stay with you, they are still deceitful, inasmuch as they fail to yield the happiness they promise you, or which you promise yourselves from them. The man who imagines he shall be happy when he becomes rich is seriously cheated. On the attainment of the ampler means he panted for, he finds his desires unsatisfied, and is as thirsty as ever. Besides, he has new fears, and solicitudes, and responsibilities, which he overlooked in his calculations. He has more luggage and a heavier burden to carry. His peace of mind is attacked at various points where before he was not liable to be touched. His elevation exposes him to the free action of the wind, which does its worst upon high things. When he was lower down in the scale he was more sheltered and less annoyed, as the wind blew over him. He is higher than he was, but certainly not happier. Deceitful mammon whispered a lie in his heart, which he was simple enough to believe. However, this unrighteous, deceitful mammon, with which so many persons foul their fingers and damage themselves, may be managed rightly and subordinated to the profiting of many, and amongst others to the persons holding it in trust. Hence we have,

II. A DIRECTION HOW TO USE IT. "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness." The steward in this parable made himself friends by disposing of property which was not his own. We must not do so. He made himself friends by foresight and contrivance. We may make ourselves friends prospectively, and lay up "a good foundation against the time to come." The end he sought was right. The means he used were wrong. With money we may make friends. But let us see to it that we do so by what is our own in the ordinary sense of the word. Shrewd worldlings have an idea that it is best to carry your friend in your pocket, that is, to make your purse your friend by taking care of it, and appropriating its contents to your own use. "Men will

praise thee when thou doest well to thyself." Ps. xlix. 18. Wise as this may be deemed, there is yet a more excellent way. That which we have lying out, away from ourselves, is our best wealth. What we have parted with on right motive and for a right purpose is surer than that we have retained for ourselves. We cannot condemn self-appropriation. In the disposal of our mammon there are several parties concerned. It must be parted out. There is—

1. *A part for ourselves.* There is a danger of us apportioning too much in this division, and so committing a fraud upon God and our poor neighbours whom we make to stand back till we are served and satisfied. Self-maintenance, however, is a duty. Every one that has health and vigour and skill is under the obligation of it. It is the purpose of him that made us. Our coarser necessities impel us to attend to them. Imperious appetites make us spring a livelihood either with our hands or with our wits. And all who can do so should, most certainly. None should lean on others when they are able to bear their own weight. No one that can walk should submit to be carried. It is a base injustice. Let all capable persons be equal to their own necessities, then there will be a better chance of the really indigent being comfortably supplied. Only let those who provide for themselves be careful not to take *much more* than their need requires. Our real wants are soon supplied. So much for the mouth, to nourish the system. Let it have good nourishing food and sufficient of it. Then so much for the trunk, to protect and warm it. Let it have decent clothing. Then so much for the mind, to sate its appetite for information. The balance left after these claims are reasonably met will be more or less according to our respective producing abilities. What is to be done with the balance? Many presume that they are at liberty to do what they please with it. Because it is not all wanted to meet their actual wants they make to themselves a world of *artificial* wants. So their surplus is wasted in fictitious channels, and consumed upon themselves to feed ambition or gratify pride, or obtain distinction. Ask them to reduce their artificial necessities for the sake of grave claims which you have to submit to them, their ingenuity falls upon arguments forthwith to prove that these so called artificial wants are real and pressing, and that their expenditure over them is a great benefit to society. It will be well for them if they were moved by such benevolent feelings as their arguments insinuate. Take enough for yourself, but let conscience rule you, and have respect to other claims. There should be,

2. *A part for God.* As the Proprietor of the world which he made and sustains, an acknowledgment is certainly due to him. We do not mean an acknowledgment with the lips, a praise-offering or prosy thanks, that costs no more than a little breath and a heaving motion of the chest. He values that, and expects it, and

will accept it; but he claims more. He has a sanctuary, and a staff of officers who are his visible representatives. Though he needs nothing for himself, he appoints his tabernacles and his altars as a financial medium in respect to which we may render him solid tribute. In an earlier dispensation the actual amount or proportion to be given was fixed. Some will have it that this still holds, and that we are bound to devote the one-tenth of our income for church use. We are not prepared to affirm this, nor anxious to deny it. We think this dispensation is different from that, and that more is now left to voluntary impulse, because it is presumed there will be more generous disposition now than there was then. Christians are expected to keep the house of God in decent repair, and provide an adequate maintenance for those who labour in the word and doctrine. And this is not to be left to the wealthy members of the church, but it is to be shared in by those who are in humbler circumstances. It was always understood that the rich should do more than the poor, because they *could do* more without any strain upon them. But the poor were always expected to do something. And the demand made upon them was an honour to them. There was the half-shekel atonement, an annual payment which every male member of the Hebrew commonwealth was liable to, at twenty years of age—a most remarkable thing. This, every one must pay, however poor he was. There was no abatement because a man was poor, and no addition was allowed if a man was ever so rich; to teach us that in the Divine estimate, a poor man was a man—nothing less, and that a rich man was but a man—nothing more, and that both were equally precious to him that made them both. In the parable before us we find the tenants each owing a certain proportion of the land's produce to the proprietor. The Owner of the world of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things, may much more demand substantial tribute as the sign of his supreme and original right. Again, there should be,

3. A *part for the poor.* In both Testaments this is largely insisted on. Not to burden the subject too much, we will quote from the later Scriptures only. Luke xi. 41. reads, "But rather give alms of such things as ye have, and behold all things are clean unto you." The margin is still better, as it brings out a principle. It reads, "But rather give alms *as you are able.*" "It is accepted according to that a man hath and not accor ding to that he hath not." Less is accepted of him that hath little; more is expected of him that hath much. As the law of proportion or of ability comes into play, so also system and periodical attention should be observed. The Apostle's rule of weekly contributions to the poor's fund would keep it always replenished. "Now concerning the collections for the saints as I have given order to the churches of

Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. This good work was a holy employment, and no breach on sanctity—it was to be done on the Sabbath, "the first day of the week." Moreover, there are special directions given on this subject, teaching us under urgent circumstances to have recourse to certain devices to put ourselves into a position to help the poor. For example, in case of urgency, we might sell some needless article, or superfluous property, and devote the proceeds. "Sell that ye have and give alms," (Luke xii. 33.) that is, sell that ye have, that ye may have something to distribute to the needy. You may be able to give alms without doing so. All the better. Be thankful, and let your generosity have scope with what comes to hand. And if, at any time, your charity-money runs out, and you have need of more and cannot come by it otherwise, *sell*, not necessary things, to leave yourself bare, but some trinket or ornament that may be parted with without affecting your personal comfort. Another thing commended, not to say commanded, is diligence in our manual toils or in the way of our vocation. This is likely to place means at our disposal. We refer you to apostolic counsel for this: "Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, *that he may have to give to him that needeth.*" Eph. iv. 28. Religion prompts a man to work for everything he eats and wears, and to be in no one's debt, and if possible never to need charitable aid; but to put himself into circumstances rather to render such aid to others. We quote again: "And that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands as we commanded you; that ye may walk honestly towards them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing," or as the margin, "of no man." 1 Thess. iv. 11, 12. This is sound, wholesome counsel. And let every capable man carry it out, honourably, and be self-sustaining. But because all are not healthy and prosperous, and not able to bear their own weight, the able artisan or mechanic must not grudge to work an extra hour, or yield a trifle out of his liberal earnings, to assist a fellow creature whom providence has not favoured equally with him. Let him cover his own wants in the first instance, both present and prospective, if possible, and cheerfully devote a part of his surplus to help others. It becomes a church to look to its own members strictly, and at the same time not to confine itself, but to extend its charities to those who are without, as it finds ways and means. "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially to them who are of the household of faith." Gal. vi. 10. Thus doing we shall make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. The treacherous fallacious wealth shall be forced

into a true service, and shall draw upon us the gratitude of the poor and the respect of all good men. The blessing of the perishing will come upon us. The orphan and the widow will pray for us. And he who is their champion and advocate will not allow our kind deeds to pass unnoticed. And if we should not always meet with due returns of gratitude and respect from men, (which it is better not to rely on, or to look for), there is a faithful Chronicler above. In all we do let us have respect to him, and weave religious motivity into all our charities, then we shall suffer no loss. It is time now for us to consider,

III. THE RESULT TO BE EXPECTED. "That when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." The scholars turn the words variously. "That when ye shall be *eclipsed*," some read it. Death is the dark point, which when we approach, a gloom is thrown on the whole sphere of our mortal existence. All our distinctions, titles, honours and possessions, are cast into shade. Our personal comeliness disappears. "When thou with rebukes dost correct man for iniquity, thou makest his beauty to consume away like a moth; surely every man is vanity. Ps. xxxix. 11. "Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passeth; *thou changest his countenance* and sendest him away." Job xiv. 20. "Beautiful in death!" is a sentiment that borrows largely from the fancy of the beholder. It is an eclipse. The lustre is gone. The sun, the light, the moon, and the stars are indeed darkened. But to a Christian it is only temporary, like an eclipse that soon passes off, and is succeeded by celestial brightness.

That when ye *fail!* And we *will* fail. We fail by degrees. When our prime is past, and we begin to wrinkle and wither, we fail thenceforward. We fade like the leaf in autumn, which becomes sear and dry and falls to the ground. Our sight fails, our hearing fails, our voice fails, our hair fails, our teeth fail, our limbs fail. We fail all over, and last of all our heart fails, and ceases its pulsations. Cotemporary with the body, the mind fails, the memory, imagination, understanding, and will, are all affected with the debility of the body, though not in all cases. In some the mind is strong when the body is weak. The decree is gone forth for the children of men to return to their original. Ps. xc. 3. Our days are numbered, and at the destined hour "destruction" will do its work upon our feeble frame. That hour comes on apace. It has been coming long, and makes a steady and regular advance. Hour of mystery! No man knows how near or how remote it may be. The eclipse of sun, or moon, or other planets can be told to the hour and to the smallest fraction of an hour. This eclipse no science can foretell. There is no uniform rule. It depends upon will, the will of One who gives no account of his matters. The

uncertainty is good, since it supplies a motive to constant vigilance.

"That *after your discharge* they may receive you into everlasting habitations." So it is rendered by a scholar of some note. This makes it parallel with the steward who was dismissed from office. And what is life but a solemn trust? And what is death but a discharge? Our life is not our own property. The things we possess we do but farm on behalf of another. With the talents we hold, we occupy or trade for the "Nobleman" in the "far country." It is our interest to remember that we are only trustees. If a dream comes over us that we are owners and proprietors, and that feeling takes a practical hold of us, and rules our movements, the hour of discharge will be upon us soon, and will shake us out of this terrible mistake, and set the truth before us in the searching light of death and eternity. Pause, my fellow-students, and examine your books, and be ready for an honourable discharge, that your master himself may be amongst the friends who shall wait to receive you, and open a door for you, when your term is expired.

The friends who will receive the "good steward of the manifold grace of God"—who are they? *Jesus* is our chief friend. He removed the legal hinderance to our admission to heaven. On finishing the atoning work he went to prepare the mansions which he had purchased. He has possession for us. It cost his blood to procure us admittance. And yet he will speak of the kindnesses we have shown to his followers, as if they formed the basis of our reception. Apart from his interposition, these good deeds could have challenged no such reward. *He* will receive us. *Angels* will receive us. They are our servants and minister to our good now, and they will not be indifferent about us in a dying hour. The *poor saints* who have fore-run us to heaven will receive us, especially such to whose wants we ministered when they were on earth. To a severe commentator who objects that those we aid may never go to heaven, it is sufficient to answer that some of them very likely will. And whereas he says we may go to heaven sooner than they do, as they may survive us on earth, and not be in heaven to receive us; it suffices to say that if some remain behind us on earth, it is just as probable that others of them will go before us to heaven. It is a piece of needless criticism. Losing sight of the drapery of the text, the main question is, whether the doctrine of Christian generosity finding its reward in heaven is sound and scriptural. If so, the possible absence of those who received our Christian bounty is a mere accident and trifle that does not affect the case. For anything that we know, however, the text may be fulfilled to the letter, and those we befriended on earth may meet

us at the gates, and give us welcome. They will not receive us into *their* houses. We shall have places of our own.

For those who are critical and literary, we may say, there is another way to construe this clause. Some suspect an idiom and give it an impersonal turn—"That when ye fail *ye may be received* into everlasting habitations;" without reference to any receiving parties, whether angels or men. Can any person suppose for a moment that it will be a cold reception? Will the most inconsiderable saint slip into heaven without an introduction? Are not the gates watched by orderly ushers that are always on duty? When you arrive it will be known. And no one there will wish you had not come. You will be hailed by many that you know, and by many more whose faces you never saw in the flesh. Some who had a hand in your conversion, and others to whose conversion you contributed, will meet you there. Old leaders, and preachers, and class-mates, and fellow-communicants at the Lord's table—can we think that on passing to heaven they lose all remembrance of and interest in us? It is very possible that their fuller bliss cannot be realised until we go to them, nor ours either, till our successors complete their warfare and are dismissed with honour. See Heb. xi. 39, 40, and Rev. vi. 11. We can but guess the nature of the reception we shall have. Then think of the long stay! What shall we be received into? "Everlasting habitations." It happens that the word for habitations is the same that is used for tabernacles, meaning ordinarily tents, frail, slender, temporary abodes; but sometimes more substantial and durable residences. Here, however, the qualifying adjective puts all right —"*everlasting* habitations." Our future dwelling-places have no element of decay or corruption, and are not liable to the wear and tear of unkindly seasons. No external accident can injure them. They never need repair. They are not subject to rent or lease. They are everlasting freehold, purchased and sealed over to us by the blood of our elder Brother. They are our "own," as verse 12 says. What we have now is not our own, as we cannot ensure its stay with us nor our stay with it. What we go to is our own, as it will always remain, and we also will never leave it.

In the light of our future hopes we cannot but cultivate a freedom and superiority of mind over the transient possessions of this world. Their grandest use is to subordinate them to our future glory. If providence have burdened any of you with more money and means than others have, account it a happiness that thereby you have the opportunity of distributing to the necessity of saints, and communicating to the wants of sinners. Be careful not to spend upon yourself in fancies what was given you to cover the real wants of others. Rightly expended, it will meet you again.

Devoted in false outlay, it will at least diminish the weight and worth of your crown, and cast a shade over its brightness.

Then, what shall be said concerning a number of Christians, who, on account of limited means, were debarred the privilege of exercising charity, or were even obliged to be receivers of aid? Shall they be doomed to wear a lighter crown because hard necessity did shut against them the door of opportunity? Will a feeling of inferiority and pauperism haunt them even in heaven? We think not. It is true that the final judgment will take note of our actual doings. We shall be rewarded according to our *works*. But the judgment will run deeper. God will judge the *hearts* of men. "Thou didst well that it was in thine heart." 1 Kings vii. 18. He will credit you for all the good you really meant, or felt, to do, but could not. His omniscience enables him to know how much or how little you would have done, if able. Those who were pinned down to a low and suffering condition, if they have a less reward for active labours, will have a larger on the score of endurance. Their tribulation and poverty, contentment and resignation, will be calculated to an exactness by him that "weigheth the spirits." The patience of the poor may be as amply rewarded as the beneficence of the rich. There is, therefore, no need for the one class to feel degraded by the necessity they were in of receiving aid, and no room for the other to cherish the pride of benefactors.

We commend our remarks to the grave consideration of such as are able to communicate in any degree, and close up by reminding you that no loss is sustained by what is given in this direction. "God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work." 2 Cor. ix. 8. May all bountiful people ever have abundance. Amen.

T. G.

Art. IV.—JOHN KNOX.

OF all the illustrious men whom Scotland has produced there is no one whose memory the people of that country cherish with such profound love and reverence as the memory of John Knox. An exception may perhaps be made in favour of William Wallace, the patriot hero, whose romantic valour stemed the tide of Anglo-Norman invasion, and kindled in the breasts of his countrymen

that ardent love of freedom which, under the chivalrous generalship of Bruce, secured the independence of the country. But the two men, Knox and Wallace, ought scarcely to be placed in rivalry. The spheres they occupied are different, and each is pre-eminent in his sphere. What Wallace achieved for the civil liberties of Scotland, Knox achieved for its religious liberties. By his unflinching courage, his indomitable perseverance, his uncorruptable integrity,—by the sagacity of his counsels, the fire of his eloquence, and the ardour of his zeal, he did incalculably more than any other single man to deliver his country from a tyranny worse than that of the Normans,—a spiritual tyranny, under whose hateful influence the souls of the people were destroyed.

In presenting the readers of the "Ambassador" with a sketch of this illustrious reformer, we shall avail ourselves freely of Dr. M'Crie's "Life of Knox," collating it with Knox's own "History of the Reformation," and with Dr. Robertson's "History of Scotland."

At the period of Knox's birth, which occurred in the year 1505, the Popish religion had obtained undisputed and universal ascendency in Scotland. The light of Divine truth which, for several ages, the Culdees sacredly conserved and zealously disseminated, had, by the schemings, the assumptions, and the successive encroachments of the Popish priests, been extinguished, and in its place was substituted the mock-light, or, we should rather say, the thick darkness of a blind and blinding superstition. Popery in its most approved form, the form it assumes in Protestant countries, is a gross and grievous delusion, a soul-destroying corruption of the sublimely simple religion of Christ; but the Popery of Scotland was of the very worst type, destitute altogether of redeeming qualities. Ignorance and ambition, licentiousness and rapacity, constituted the leading features of its priesthood. Devoted to secular pursuits or abandoned to sensual pleasure, the regular clergy devolved the work of teaching the people upon a class of mendicant monks, who, ignorant of the Gospel themselves, tickled the ears and deluded the souls of their hearers with frothy jests and unmeaning fables. But though blind and indifferent to their duties as the ministers of religion, the clergy were quick to observe and vigilant to repress every indication of religious freedom or earnestness in the people. If, by some happy accident, any person was fortunate enough to obtain a glimpse of Gospel truth amidst the pervading gloom, and imprudent enough to proclaim his new convictions, he was instantly branded as a heretic, cast into prison, and, if he did not recant, committed to the flames. Patrick Hamilton, a young man of royal lineage, of spotless reputation, of distinguished attainments, and of amiable spirit, had the honour of being the first martyr for the truth in Scotland. Brought

himself by some unknown means to the light of the Gospel, and grieved in spirit at the prevailing superstition, he burned with fervent desire to impart to his countrymen the truth by which his own mind had been made free. His first attempts to enlighten the people aroused the ire of the clergy, and being decoyed to St. Andrew's, under the pretence that the Archbishop desired to have a free consultation with him, he was summarily condemned as a heretic and burned to death. This happened in the year 1528. The sentiments which brought Hamilton to the stake soon began to take root in many minds, chiefly by means of printed copies of the Scriptures and other Protestant books procured from England. These books being under the ban of the Church, and exposing their possessors to the most terrible inflictions, were read in secret; and it was no unusual thing for persons whose hearts God had touched to meet by stealth at midnight, and with bated breath to edify one another with lessons from the book of God. Many persons detected in such exercises as these were committed to the flames; but instead of this cruelty repressing, it seemed rather to foster the growth of the obnoxious opinions; and not only many of the common people but several of the gentry and nobility were brought under their influence. The clergy were furious; they chafed with rage at the abortiveness of their repressive measures; but, resolved not to be baulked of their design to purge the country of the pestilential heresy, and having the confidence of the king, they attempted to gain the royal signature to a decree by which all the principal persons of the kingdom, suspected of favouring the reformed doctrines, should by one bloody stroke be cut off; and they probably would have accomplished their atrocious intentions had not the unexpected death of the king occurred just before his signature could be obtained. The Earl of Arran, who succeeded to the regency of the kingdom, favoured the reformed doctrine at the beginning of his administration; but being of a weak, unstable character, he afterwards succumbed to the influence of the clergy and abetted their cruelties. By the united scheming of the regent and the clergy, the young queen was betrothed to the Dauphin of France, and sent into that country to finish her education. Meanwhile, in defiance of persecution, the Protestant doctrines continued to spread, avowed defections from the Popish Church became more frequent, while many persons, wanting the courage to proclaim their conversion, cherished the new faith in secrecy, hoping for better times. Among the converts to the truth, and by far the most distinguished of them all, was John Knox.

Knox was born at Haddington, and was educated at the University of Glasgow. So rapidly did he advance in learning, that before he had quite reached his twenty-fifth year he became lec-

turer in philosophy, and was advanced to clerical orders. He pursued his studies about five years longer, unmoved it would seem by the new doctrines which were then producing no small commotion in different parts of the country. At length, becoming dissatisfied with the philosophy taught in the schools, the writings of Jerome and Augustine attracted his attention, and by this means he was led to the study of the Holy Scriptures. He had reached his thirty-fifth year before breaking his connection with Popery, and surrendering his mind wholly to the reformed faith. Knox was slow in arriving at conviction, not for want of aptitude or perspicacity of mind, but because he went to the root of the questions in dispute, and examined them in their diversified connections and bearings. Hence his opinions, once formed, were enduring, immovable, solidifying into a sort of granite-formation, resisting and defying all attempts to alter them. Thoroughly convinced of the errors and corruptions of Popery, he gave public utterance to his new views, first of all while delivering a course of lectures at St. Andrews. Measures of vengeance were immediately resolved upon by the clergy, to whose wrath he would certainly have fallen a victim had he not become apprised of their intentions and fled to the south of Scotland, where he fortunately obtained shelter in the house of a gentleman at Langniddrie. The hired assassins of Archbishop Beatoun tracked his steps; his life was in imminent jeopardy; but a gracious providence had him in safe keeping. Not long after this the Archbishop himself, a man of the most profligate and cruel habits, met with the fate he designed for Knox. Whilst revelling in sensual pleasure in the castle of St. Andrews, he was surprised and slain by a company of Protestant gentlemen, who were excited to this act of vengeance by his numerous and flagitious crimes. The death of the Cardinal was made the occasion of stigmatising the whole body of reformers as men of unscrupulous and violent spirit; but whatever might be their opinion of the act itself, they for the most part disapproved the manner in which it was executed. Their sentiments have been happily expressed in the following stanzas:—

> "As for the cardinal, we grant,
> He was a man we weel might want,
> And we'll forget him soon;
> And yet I think, the sooth to say,
> Although the loon is weel away,
> The deed was foully done."

After killing the archbishop, his executioners entrenched themselves in the castle, where having obtained assistance from England by sea, they were able to set at defiance all attempts of the regent to dislodge them. Meanwhile the persecution of the Protestants throughout the country proceeded with increased fury, and Knox

was compelled to remove from one hiding place to another, to escape the vigilant pursuit of his enemies. Wearied with this kind of life, and concluding that if he remained in Scotland he must one day or other fall a victim to the wrath of the clergy, he resolved to leave the country; but at the earnest entreaty of his friends he gave up that design, and betook himself to the castle of St. Andrews, where his time was at first occupied in the education of two young gentlemen committed to his care. The congregation of reformers there assembled perceiving his superior abilities, and anxious to secure an efficient helper to the minister already settled amongst them, resolved unanimously to invite him to become his co-pastor. The Sabbath after this had been agreed upon, at the close of the public service, the preacher turned to Knox, told him the wish of the church, and solemnly required of him, if he would not offend the Lord and deprive his people of the aids they needed, to yield a ready compliance. He was thunderstruck with this address, tears gushed from his eyes, and, without saying a word in reply, he rushed to his chamber, where for awhile he remained prostrate in a state of extreme agitation. Gradually, however, he became calm, thoughtfully considered the whole case, and, believing it to be the will of God that he should become a minister of his truth, he surrendered himself to the work. In addition to the pastoral oversight of the garrison he preached frequently to the people of the town, and conducted several important discussions with the Popish priests, who, in every instance, were ignominiously defeated by his superior learning, sagacity, and eloquence. But his ministry at St. Andrews soon terminated. The regent having procured some French forces to reduce the castle, the defenders were besieged by sea and land, and, after making a gallant resistance, they surrendered to the French on honourable terms. It was stipulated that they should be taken to France and there set at liberty; but by the secret machinations of the priests, the terms of the treaty were violated. On reaching France, instead of being liberated, they were transferred to the state galleys and treated as criminals. This cruel treatment was imbittered by the idolatrous services of Popery performed in their presence, and by frequent attempts to persuade them back to the Popish church. But these Scotchmen proved inflexibly stubborn, and, sometimes, proudly defiant. An incident occurred on board the galleys which shows in a characteristic light the bearing they displayed to their Gallican masters. One day a finely adorned image of the Virgin being brought on board the galley where Knox was confined, he was required to give it the kiss of adoration. Revolting at the thought of the most distant compliance with idol-worship, he sternly refused, saying, that all such images were accursed of God. The officer who held the image attempted in rather rough style to

force it to his mouth, and said, "But you shall kiss it." Provoked beyond endurance by this outrageous conduct, Knox snatched the image from the hands of the officer and flung it into the river, saying, "Let our ladie learn to swim; she is light enough."

After being confined in the galleys for eighteen months, he made his escape to England, where Archbishop Cranmer gave him a generous welcome and employed him as an itinerant preacher. At Berwick, Newcastle, and in other parts of England, signal success attended his labours: in preaching, his fervid eloquence swayed the minds of the people, and in debate, his dialectical skill and logical force confounded the sophistry of the priests. The great impression he made on the public mind in favour of the reformed doctrine, awoke the resentment of the Popish nobility, who attempted to ruin his reputation by preferring serious charges against him to the privy council. His defence was triumphant. The advisers of the king showed their confidence in his integrity and their appreciation of his abilities by pressing a bishopric on his acceptance; but his conscientious objections to episcopacy, and the unsettled state of religion in England portending imminent troubles, led him to refuse the generous offer and to remain untrammelled by ecclesiastical engagements. The fears which he entertained in reference to the religious interests of the country were realised at the death of the king, which occurred soon after. Mary—"the bloody Mary," as she has been emphatically called,—succeeding to the throne, the reformation was proscribed, Popery re-established, and the fires of persecution were lighted all over the land. Knox wished to remain and abide his fate, that if God so pleased he might seal the truth he had preached with his blood; but at the earnest solicitation of his friends, who were anxious that he might be spared for future usefulness, he left England for the continent, where he resided for awhile at Geneva, formed acquaintanceship with Calvin and other distinguished reformers, applied himself to the study of the Hebrew and other branches of sacred literature, officiated for a short time as minister of an English church at Frankfort, and in other ways endeavoured as opportunity occurred to render himself acceptable to God and useful to man. But all the while, both when in England and on the continent, his heart yearned towards his native country, longing for the day, if ever it might come, when among his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh, he would be privileged to proclaim with unfettered voice the pure Gospel of Christ.

The accession of the queen dowager to the regency of Scotland operated to some degree in favour of the Protestants. Not that she bore any love to the reformed cause; on the contrary, she hated it with the hereditary bigotry of the house of Guise, of which she was a member; but in order to the accomplishment of her am-

bitious designs, she found it expedient to hold the clergy in check and to favour the protestants, intending when circumstances would allow to throw off her disguise and lend all her energies to the suppression of the reformation. Meanwhile the English queen hunted down her protestant subjects with unrelenting bigotry, crimsoning the land with their blood and driving them into exile. Many of them escaped to Scotland, where they found a safe retreat, and were even allowed without molestation to teach their doctrines in private houses. Aware that the regent showed no aversion to the private teachings of the fugitives, the clergy did not venture to offer them much annoyance. Thus, by the intolerent bigotry of one woman and the cunning duplicity of another, both of whom were inveterate papists, the cause of the reformation in Scotland was considerably advanced.

Apprised of the favourable change which had occurred, Knox resolved to visit his native country. Taking ship from one of the French ports, he landed at Berwick, and thence proceeded to Edinburgh, where he met privately with several noblemen who afterwards took a prominent part in the reformation. After remaining there a short while he visited several other parts of Scotland, staying at the houses of gentlemen who favoured the reformation, and preaching to private companions as opportunity allowed. However much it was to be desired, it was impossible to keep the clergy long ignorant of Knox's presence in the country. When informed of the fact they were smitten with consternation, and, apprehensive of the worst consequences if he were allowed to remain at large, they summoned him to meet a convention of their order then sitting at Edinburgh. Prepared without hesitato obey the summons, Knox proceeded in company with a number of the western gentlemen towards Edinburgh. Not sure of the support of the queen-regent in their measures against Knox, and dreading the vengeance of the gentlemen by whom he was accompanied, the clergy hurriedly brought their sittings to a close and dispersed, assigning as a reason for not proceeding with the summons against him that it had been drawn up in an informal manner. Availing himself of their absence, he preached the reformed doctrines in Edinburgh for ten successive days, morning and afternoon; no one attempting to disturb him. This was a short but blessed interval of free activity. After spending three days in preaching with his characteristic fulness and fervency, he says, in a letter hastily written to his mother-in-law, "The trumpet blew the old sound three days together, till private houses of indifferent largeness could not contain the voice of it. . . . . O, sweet were the death that should follow such forty days in Edinburgh, as I have had three." Letters now arrived from Geneva, inviting him to become the pastor of the English Church in that city. His friends

dissuaded him from accepting the invitation; but, believing it to be the call of Providence, and assured that if he remained much longer in Scotland he would precipitate a revolution and involve the country in the horrors of civil war, he took leave of his friends and proceeded to the continent. No sooner had Knox departed than the clergy assembling in convention, condemned him as a heretic in religion and as a traitor to his country, and with all the formalities of a public execution, burned his effigy. In this contemptable manner they wreaked their impotent fury upon a man whom they durst not meet face to face.

During the two years which Knox now passed at Geneva, he enjoyed greater quietness than in any other period of his life. Much of his leisure was spent in the bosom of his family, in the company of distinguished divines, and in the pursuits of sacred literature. He also employed himself along with several learned men of his congregation, in a new translation of the Scriptures into English, which is still known by the name of the Geneva Bible. The interest which he continued to cherish for his native country led him to maintain a frequent correspondence with the Scottish noblemen who favoured the reformation, to whom he imparted many judicious counsels as to the course they ought to pursue in their difficult circumstances. In addition to several small works which proceeded from his pen while at Geneva, he published his celebrated "Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous regiment of Women," in which he attacked with vehemence the practice of exalting women to the government of nations. It is probable that his attention had been attracted to this subject on the accession of Mary to the throne of England; but, deferring to the wishes of the brethren whom he consulted, he had hitherto suppressed his sentiments. The continued tyranny and increasing cruelties of Mary wore out his patience, and he therefore applied the trumpet to his mouth and uttered his terrible blast.

When this treatise first appeared, the Protestant exiles on the continent generally approved of it, and would gladly have seen its opinions reduced to practice; but shortly afterwards, Mary dying and Elizabeth succeeding to the throne of England, many of them raised a loud outcry against both the book and the author. John Aylmer, formerly archdeacon of Stowe, published a reply to Knox; but his treatise is more remarkable for rhetorical flourish than logical force, and the obvious design of the author is rather to procure the favour of Elizabeth than to demonstrate the unsoundness of Knox's opinions. But though constituting himself the champion of the ladies, whose right to government he stoutly defends, he does by no means spare their faults, as is evident from the following passage:—"Some women," says he, "be wiser, better learned, discreeter, constanter than a number of men;" but the greater num-

ber he describes as "fond, foolish, wanton, flibbergibs, tatlers, trifling, wavering, witles, without council, feeble, carls, rash, proud, daintie, nise, talebearers, eves-droppers, rumour-raisers, evil-tongued, worse-minded, and in everywise doltified with the dregges of the devil's dounge-hill." What think you, fair ladies, of this description of your sex, and by one of your champions, too? Knox was vehement, and in some instances coarse, but the inherent nobility of his nature prevented him descending to such vile speech. In spite, however, of the offensive epithets with which Aylmer aspersed the sex, he had so stoutly defended the right of women to rule, and had administered flattering unction to the soul of Elizabeth with such ingenuity, that, as a reward of his services, he was advanced to the bishopric of London, while on the other hand, Knox inherited the illwill of that haughty princess as long as she lived, and could not obtain permission without much difficulty to set foot again on English ground.

Meanwhile the work of reformation in Scotland proceeded favourably. Animated by the letters which they received from Knox, the Protestant barons held several meetings to strengthen each others hands and to devise such measures as would be likely to promote the spread of the faith. The clergy perceiving the progress of the reformed doctrine, prevailed on the queen-regent to summon for trial such persons as had presumed to preach without their authority; but she was obliged to abandon the process against them in consequence of certain gentlemen from the west demanding their release in a tone which implied that they were resolved not to be refused. Nothing excited the ire of the clergy more than the practice which now became common of the Protestant lords harbouring in their houses and protecting the reformed preachers; for they judged truly that there was little hope of rooting out the prevailing heresy so long as some of the principal men of the kingdom sheltered and protected its preachers. Foiled in their endeavours to induce a discontinuance of this practice, they proceeded with relentless fury against such of the reformers as were within their reach, and revived those persecuting measures which, owing to the political circumstances of the country, had been discontinued for several years. The first victim of their reawakened wrath was Walter Mill, an old man, formerly a parish priest, who had been convicted of heresy in the days of Cardinal Beatoun and condemned to the flames, but, escaping from execution, he continued to preach the Gospel, sometimes in private and sometimes publicly, in different parts of the kingdom. He now appeared before the court at St. Andrews so worn down with age and the sufferings he had passed through, that his presence excited the compassion of the people, and it was thought that he would not have strength to answer the questions put to him. To

the surprise of all, he conducted his defence with extraordinary energy and courage. When interrogated as to the doctrines he preached, he boldly declared his views, showed their harmony with the word of God, and exposed the absurdity and pernicious tendency of the Popish doctrines. He was condemned to the flames; but such was the compassion excited by his appearance and the horror of the doom to which he was sentenced, that the clergy could not procure a secular magistrate to carry their verdict into effect, and were obliged to employ a worthless minion of their own to perform the odious task. The old man met his fate with true Christian heroism. As he stood bound to the stake, and as the flames gathered round him, he was heard to say, "As for me, I am fourscore and two years old, and cannot live long by course of nature; but a hundred better men shall rise out of the ashes of my bones. I trust in God I shall be the last that shall suffer death in Scotland for this cause."

The martyrdom of this venerable man produced an extraordinary sensation, and was followed by consequences of the greatest moment. Even the most ignorant and irreligious of the people viewed it with horror, and could not refrain from expressing their detestation of its reverend authors. Throwing aside the prudential restraints which had hitherto hampered their movements, the protestants openly joined in the reformed worship, and avowed their determination to adhere to it publicly at all hazards. The seed of divine truth which had for years been sown with tears and blood suddenly sprang to light; all over the land numbers of persons, as if moved by an irresistable impulse, publicly renounced their connection with popery, and avowed their attachment to the reformation; everything betokened that the nation had reached a revolutionary crisis.

Previous to the martyrdom of Mill the protestant barons had invited Knox to return to Scotland, but he did not see his way clear to comply; they now renewed their invitation with increased urgency. If it be supposed that the fear of personal danger deterred Knox from appearing on the arena of conflict, this shows that the character of the reformer is wholly misunderstood. His entire history proves that the fear of man never caused him to veer one hair's breadth from the path of duty. He hesitated at first to comply with the request of the barons from the belief that his premature appearance in Scotland would precipitate a revolutionary struggle and involve the country in civil war and blood. Now, however, the intelligence which he received convinced him that, let the consequences be ever so serious, he would be unfaithful to his heavenly master if he hesitated longer. In arranging to return home he wished to have an interview with the advisors of Elizabeth on a subject of vital interest to the independence of both England

and Scotland. He had learned from a French courtier with whom he had formed acquaintance that the princes of Lorraine, in concert with their sister the queen regent of Scotland, were hatching a scheme to set up the claim of the young queen of Scots to the throne of England and to denounce Elizabeth as a bastard and a heretic. In order to the accomplishment of this design they intended first to suppress the reformation in Scotland and then proceed to the subjugation of England. Wishful to communicate this important intelligence to the English government, Knox desired permission to visit England on his way home; but the mind of Elizabeth having been prejudiced against him, not only by his book on female government, but also by the slanderous accusations of some of the returned exiles, who represented him as an enemy to her person, he was prohibited from setting foot on English soil. Swallowing this rebuff as well as his irritable temper would allow, he sailed direct for Leith, where he arrived on the 2nd of May, 1559.

On his arrival he found the country in an extremely critical state. The queen regent having accomplished her ambitious designs, and assured of military succours from France, had thrown off her disguise, concluded a treaty with the clergy, and proclaimed her intention of forcibly suppressing the reformed religion. A proclamation appeared in her name prohibiting divine worship in any other way than according to the authorised standards; and the reformed preachers were summoned to appear before her justiciary court at Stirling. Undeterred by the fulminations which were launched against him as soon as his arrival was known, Knox resolved to appear at the trial of the accused preachers and assist them in their defence. In the company of a large number of protestant lords and gentlemen he proceeded as far as Perth on the way to Stirling; but the regent, alarmed at the approach of such formidable numbers, began to temporise, and by promising to put a stop to the trial induced many of the protestants to return to their homes. But when the day of trial came the names of the preachers were read over by her order, and as they did not appear they were outlawed. On the day that intelligence of this perfidious transaction reached Perth, Knox, who still continued in that town, preached a sermon on the idolatry of the mass and of image worship. The congregation had quietly separated, and only a few persons loitered in the church, when one of the priests, as if in contempt of the doctrine which had just been preached, uncovered a rich altar piece adorned with images, and proceeded to celebrate mass. A young man standing by, feeling annoyed at impudence of the priest, uttered some expressions of dissatisfaction, which led the priest to strike him. Irritated with the blow, the youth seized a stone and flung it at the priest, but, missing its

object, it struck the altar and broke one of the images. By this time the bystanders became excited; their sympathies were with the young man; they joined in the affray, and in a few seconds the priest had fled, the altar was upset, and all the ornaments of the church were torn down and trampled in the dust. This hubbub soon collected a crowd of disorderly persons, who, by a sudden impulse, flew to the monasteries of the town and ere they could be appeased the costly houses of the friars and monks were laid in ruins. This tumult displeased Knox, for whatever might be his opinion with regard to the destruction of the haunts and monuments of idolatry, he certainly did not wish the work to be wrought in this disorderly manner.

On discovering the perfidious character and hostile intentions of the regent, the leading Protestants formed themselves into an association, known by the name of The Congregation, and, in harmony with the feudal ideas then prevalent in Scotland, resolved to abolish popery, and establish the protestant worship in all places to which their authority extended, and where the people generally were friendly to the design. Pursuant to this resolution two noblemen of some influence at St. Andrews, made an appointment with Knox to meet in that city and there make the first public attempt to establish the reformed worship. They met accordingly; but when the archbishop heard that Knox intended to preach in the cathedral, he collected an armed force, and sent him information that if he appeared in the pulpit he would order the soldiers to shoot him. The retinue of the nobleman who accompanied Knox was small, the queen lay with an army at a short distance, and the disposition of the inhabitants was uncertain. On these grounds Knox was earnestly dissuaded from attempting to preach in the cathedral, as his own life and that of his friends might be sacrificed. The firmness and intrepidity which he displayed on this occasion rendered important service to the reformed cause. "I can take God to witness," he said, "that I never preached in contempt of any man, or to hurt any earthly creature; but to delay to preach next day, unless forcibly hindered, I cannot in conscience agree. As for the fear of danger that may come to me, let no man be solicitous, for my life is in the custody of him whose glory I seek. I desire the hand or weapon of no man to defend me." Accordingly he appeared in the pulpit next day, and preached without the slightest interruption to a numerous assembly including many of the clergy. On the three following days, also, he preached in the same place with such effect that the magistrates and inhabitants unanimously agreed to set up the reformed worship. The example of St. Andrews operated with magical effect all over the kingdom, especially in the principal towns; the churches were

purged of their popish trumpery, the monasteries were overthrown, and the reformation was publicly sanctioned.

Convinced that the regent conspired against their lives and liberties, and that no hope remained of the country enjoying repose while she swayed supreme authority, the lords of the congregation resolved, after solemn deliberation, to depose her from the regency until such time as a free parliament should meet. The civil war which had commenced before this transaction, now assumed a more distinct and serious form. Had the reformers been only opposed by the domestic power of the regent they would speedily, and without foreign aid, have brought the war to a close, for they were decidedly the more numerous and influential party. But the queen was backed by the power of France, from whence a considerable body of disciplined troops had already joined her: the protestant lords were therefore obliged to apply to the court of England for assistance. Elizabeth saw it to be her interest to support the protestants; but not wishing to come to an open rupture with France she at first only aided them by private subsidies of money. Finding, however, that by the assistance of the French troops the regent had gained some successes, and that the reformers were becoming dispirited, she adopted a bolder line of policy. A fleet of English ships blocked the mouth of the Forth, preventing fresh succours arriving from France, and an English army, entering Scotland by Berwick, penetrated to Edinburgh. The regent, with her forces, was now shut up within the fortifications of Leith, whence, being seized with sudden illness, she was secretly conveyed to the Castle of Edinburgh, and shortly afterwards expired. Plenopotentiaries now arrived from France, who concluded a treaty with England, in which it was agreed that the French troops should be removed, and that the French government should refrain from interfering with the domestic interests of Scotland. In this manner the civil war terminated.

The reformation was now placed on what appeared to be a solid foundation; the nobility, with few exceptions, gave their adhesion to it; the sympathies of the great bulk of the people were decidedly in its favour; and it received a legal establishment by act of parliament. But fresh troubles were imminent. Francis, the husband of the young queen, dying about this time, she was invited by the protestant nobility to return from France and assume the reins of government into her own hands. Complying with this invitation she arrived in Scotland on the 19th of August, 1561. Mary was an extremely beautiful and a highly accomplished woman, but, of an imperious temper, addicted to pleasure and blindly devoted to the popish religion. The Scottish people were proud of their young queen, and on her arrival she met with a flattering reception; but circumstances soon transpired

to damp her joy. The deputies who had waited upon her in France with the invitation from the protestant lords were authorized to promise her nothing more than the private exercise of her religion; but at the instigation of her uncles who accompanied her she gave orders for the public celebration of mass in the chapel of Holyrood on the sabbath after her arrival. This proceeding, which could be regarded in no other light than as a wanton insult to the convictions of her subjects, enflamed their minds to a high pitch, and a riot would probably have followed had not Knox and other leading protestants calmed the excitement. Nevertheless his own mind was deeply wounded by the queen's conduct, and on the following sabbath while preaching on the evils of idolatry he said, that "one mass was more dreadful to him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm on purpose to suppress the whole religion." Besides the anxieties he felt for the common cause he had also grounds of apprehension as to his personal safety. Before leaving France the queen's mind was imbittered against him; he had been represented to her as the ringleader of her turbulent subjects, as an enemy to female government, and as an enflamatory demagogue; and in conversation with her friends she had avowed her determination of making a public example of him by having him severely punished.

A few days after her arrival in Scotland the queen had a long interview with Know, in which, among other serious charges, she accused him of writing a book against her just authority. In reply, he acknowledged that he had written the book which seemed to have offended her majesty, and was willing that the learned should judge of it. He understood that an Englishman had written against it, but he had not read his work. If the author had confuted his arguments and established the contrary opinion, he would confess his error; but to that hour he continued to think himself able to maintain the proposition affirmed in that book against any ten men in Europe. "You think, then, I have no just authority," said the queen. "Please your majesty," replied he, "learned men have in all ages had their judgments free, and most commonly disagreeing with the common judgment of the world; notwithstanding, they themselves have lived in the common society with others, and have borne patiently with the errors and imperfections which they could not amend. Even so, madam, am I content to do." He added that his sentiments on that subject should be confined to his own breast, and that his book had been written, not against her majesty, but against Mary of England. "But ye speak of women in general," said the queen. "Most true it is, madam," replied the reformer, "yet it appeareth to me that wisdom should persuade your grace never to raise trouble for that which to this day has not troubled your majesty, neither in person nor authority. If I had

intended to trouble your majesty's estate, because you are a woman, I would have chosen a time more convenient for that purpose than I can do now, when your presence is within the realm." Changing the subject, she accused him of persuading the people to receive a religion different from the one sanctioned by their princes. After he had justified his conduct on this point by adducing numerous examples from the Scriptures, the queen said, "Then you think that subjects, having the power, may resist their princes?" "If princes exceed their bounds," said the reformer, "no doubt they may be resisted by force. For no greater honour or obedience is to be given to princes than God has required to be given to father and mother. But the father may be struck with frenzy, in which he would slay his children. Now, madam, if the children arise, join together, apprehend the father, take the sword from him, bind his hands, and keep him in prison till the frenzy be over, think you, madam, that the children do any wrong? Even so, madam, is it with princes who would murder the children of God who are subject to them. Their blind zeal is nothing but a mad frenzy; therefore to take the sword from them, to bind their hands, and to cast them into prison till they be brought to a more sober mind, is no disobedience to princes, but just obedience, because it agreeth with the will of God." This bold answer struck the queen with stupor, her countenance changed, and for some time she remained speechless. Recovering herself, she said, "Well, then, I perceive my subjects shall obey you and not me, and will do what they please, and not what I command; and so I must be subject to them and not they to me." "God forbid," said the reformer, "that I should ever take upon me to command any to obey me, or to set subjects at liberty to do what pleases them. But my travail is that both princes and subjects may obey God. And think not, madam, that wrong is done you when you are required to be subject to God. This subjection is the greatest dignity that flesh can get on the face of the earth; for it shall lead them to everlasting glory." After touching upon some other subjects the queen and the reformer separated mutually dissatisfied.

In the month of May following Knox had a second interview with her majesty, occasioned by some of her flaterers informing her that in one of his sermons he had passed certain severe strictures on the revelries held at the palace, and had not spared her own character. On appearing before her majesty she charged him with speaking of her in a manner calculated to bring her under the contempt and hatred of her subjects. On being allowed to answer for himself, he told the queen that her majesty had been treated as persons usually were who neglected to attend the preaching of God's word and listened to the voice of flatterers. He was quite sure that if her majesty had been present to hear the sermon for herself, she

would have found nothing of consequence to object to. With her majesty's leave he would recapitulate the principal points he had insisted on; and for once the queen was obliged to listen to a protestant sermon. After repeating the substance of his discourse he looked round on the persons present and asked whether he had not given a faithful report. It being acknowledged by those of them who had heard the sermon that the report was faithful, the queen parted with Knox in a much gentler mood than when she received him. As he left the room in no way abashed, he overheard one of the popish attendants saying, "He is not afraid!" Regarding them with a sarcastic scowl, he exclaimed, "Why should the plesing face of a *gentilwoman* afray me? I have luiked in the faces of mony angry *men* and have not been affrayed above measaur."

In the summer of the following year the queen had another interview with Knox, in which, finding that he could not be moved by her authoritative expostulations, she adopted the more insiduous policy of treating him with seeming kindness and condescension, and at the close of the interview promising that she would act upon his advice with regard to certain matters affecting the religious condition of the country. The report which he gave to the people of the queen's sentiments operated in her majesty's favour, and for some time he cherished the hope that her mind was becoming more inclined to the reformed religion. Her subsequent conduct dissipated the pleasing deception. By cunning maneuvering she persuaded the parliament, which assembled shortly afterwards, to pass measures dangerous in the highest degree to the interests of Protestantism, and prejudicial to the liberties of her subjects.

The last interview Knox had with the queen arose from his having, in one of his sermons, referred to the public rumour of her projected marriage with a popish husband, and predicting that if allowed to take place it would be the source of many grievous troubles to the nation. The intelligence having been conveyed to her majesty he was instantly summoned to the palace. He found her agitated with anger and grief. Never had prince been so handled (she exclaimed) as she was. She had borne with all his hard speeches, she had sought his favour by every means, she had offered him audience whenever he had pleased to admonish her of her faults; "And yet," said she, "I cannot be quit of you. I vow to be revenged." While uttering these words she burst into a flood of tears. After her passion had somewhat subsided, and she had composed herself, Knox proceeded to make his defence. He said, her grace and he had at different times been engaged in controversy, but he never before perceived her to be offended with him. When it pleased God to deliver her from the bondage of error in which she had been brought up, he trusted that her

majesty would not find the freedom of his tongue offensive. Out of the pulpit he believed few people found occasion to complain of him; but there he was not his own master and was obliged to obey Him who commanded him to speak plainly and to flatter no flesh on the face of the earth. "But what have you to do with my marriage?" demanded the queen. The reformer was proceeding to state the extent of his commission when the queen interrupted him by repeating the question—"What have you to do with my marriage? and what are you in this Commonwealth?" "I am a subject born within the same, madam," replied the reformer; "and albeit I be neither earl, lord, nor baron in it, yet has God made me a profitable member within the same. Yea, madam, to me it appertains to forewarn of such dangers as may hurt it if I foresee them, as much as it doth to any of the nobility; for both my conscience and vocation require plainness of me. And therefore, madam, to yourself I say that which I spake in public place: Whensoever the nobility of this realm shall consent that you be subject to a popish husband, they do as much as in them lieth to renounce Christ, to banish the truth from them, to betray the freedom of the realm, and perchance shall in the end do small comfort to yourself." The queen now began to sob and weep with great violence, the reformer remaining silent till she became composed. He then solemnly protested that he did not delight in the distress of any creature, that he could not see his own boys weep without pain, and that far less could he rejoice in the tears of her majesty; but that seeing he had given her no just cause of offence and had only discharged his duty, he was constrained to bear her majesty's tears rather than offend his conscience or betray the interests of the Commonwealth. These words enflamed her majesty still more, and she ordered Knox instantly to leave her presence.

Shortly after this the queen attempted to compass his ruin by instituting proceedings against him on a charge of high treason; but the grounds of the charge were so flimsy, and the defence he made was so triumphant, that he received an honourable acquittal by his judges. Unable to effect his destruction by legal process, assassins were employed to murder him privately. On one occasion a gun was fired into his study with such precision of aim that the ball would certainly have passed through his body had he been sitting in his ordinary place; but he happened at the moment to have removed to another part of the room, and so escaped the deadly missile. During the last year of his life the country was convulsed with civil war, owing to the profligacy and bigotry of the queen; but amidst all the commotions of the kingdom he steadily pursued the path of duty, watched over the interests of religion, guided the counsels of the Protestants, and though often menaced with violence, was graciously preserved from harm, and permitted

to die in peace. On his death-bed he maintained a humble, pious, and cheerful temper of mind, testifying to the last the truth of the doctrines which it had been the great business of his life to disseminate and defend, and enjoying their efficacy in his experience. At intervals such words as these dropped from his lips: "Sweet Jesus, into thy hands I commend my spirit. Be merciful, O Lord, to the church which thou has redeemed. Give peace to this afflicted Commonwealth. Grant us, Lord, a perfect hatred of sin. Thou knowest, O Lord, my troubles: I do not murmur against thee." On the last day of his life one of his friends asked him if he had any pain. "It is no painful pain," said he, "but such a pain as I trust shall soon put an end to the battle." After appearing as if he had been asleep a little he aroused himself and said, "I have formerly during my frail life sustained many contests and many assaults of satan, but at present he hath assailed me most fearfully, and put forth all his strength to devour and make an end of me at once. The cunning serpent hath endeavoured to persuade me that I have merited heaven and eternal blessedness by the faithful discharge of my ministry. But blessed be God who hath enabled me to beat down and quench this fiery dart, by suggesting to me such passages of Scripture as these—'What hast thou that thou hast not received? By the grace of God I am what I am. Not I, but the grace of God in me.' Upon this satan left me; and I am persuaded the tempter shall not again attack me, but within a short time I shall, without any great pain of body or anguish of mind, exchange this mortal and miserable life for a blessed immortality through Jesus Christ." Accordingly, after a few hours, and without a struggle, he breathed his last.

Knox was twice married; first to Margery Bowes, a lady with whom he became acquainted when settled as a preacher at Berwick, and, after her death, to a daughter of Lord Ochletree, one of the Protestant barons. As this lady was much younger than the reformer and also his superior in station, the Papists reported that he had won her affections by magic. Undoubtedly there must have been a magical influence operating, else the noble lady would never have consented to marry the low-born preacher; but there is no necessity of believing that the magic was of a devilish nature. Although Knox was neither earl, lord, nor baron, he was nevertheless the greatest man in Scotland; and despite the roughness of his manners and the sternness of his mien, he was withal a lovable man. Deep springs of tenderness oozed out from his craggy soul, enriching and beautifying his private life. And as to his age, there are some men who never grow old, who preserve their strength of intellect and freshness of feeling to the last. Knox was a man of this sort; and the daughter of Lord Ocheltree might truly and

sincerely love him, as I doubt not she did, without being induced thereto by the influence of infernal magic.

The extraordinary influence which Knox acquired over his countrymen is to be attributed, in the first place, to his popular eloquence. He was not a man of polished speech or studied elocution; but he had the faculty of penetrating the hearts and swaying the passions of his hearers. His words were fiery words —flashing light to the understanding, and conviction to the conscience. His eloquence was bold, fervid, vehement, bearing down and sweeping away all obstructions, and taking the minds of men by storm. Randolph, the English ambassador to the Scottish court, who was one of his constant hearers, says of him in a letter to the secretary, Cecil, "Where your honour exhorteth as to stoutness, I assure you the voice of one man is able in an hour to put more life in us than six hundred trumpets continually blustering in our ears." The following account of his appearance and preaching a short time before his death, given by an eye witness, is exceedingly striking:—"Of all the benefits I had that year," says James Melville, referring to the year 1571, "was the coming of that notable prophet and apostle of our nation, Mr. John Knox, to St. Andrews. I heard him teach there the prophecies of Daniel, that summer and the winter following. I had my pen and my little book, and took away such things as I could comprehend. In the opening up of his text he was moderate, the space of half an hour; but when he entered to application he made me so to thrill and tremble that I could not hold my pen to write. He was very weak. I saw him every day of his doctrine go slowly and warily, with a furring of marticks about his neck, a staff in the one hand and guid, godly Richard Bannatyne, holding up the other arm, from the abbey to the parish kirk; and by the said Richard and another servant, lifted up to the pulpit, where he behoved to lean at the first entry; but, ere he had done with his sermon, he was so active and vigorous that he was like to knock the pulpit to pieces and fly out of it."

But the influence which Knox exerted over his countrymen was sustained by other and more solid qualities. His mind was singulary acute, penetrating and sagacious; bold in conception and sound in judgment. The moral qualities which adorned his character were of the noblest type. Honest, outspoken, and sincere himself, he hated every appearance of dissimulation and hypocrisy in others. The constancy with which he maintained his convictions and carried out his purposes, set at defiance the threats of his enemies and the entreaties of his friends. Even his faults were allied to and reflected the lustre of his virtues. The severity with which he publicly rebuked the highest personages of the land, though strange, and perhaps offensive to us, was justified by the

necessities and usages of the age. In his interviews with the queen, instead of being the ruffian which maudlin sentimentalists and flippant infidels have tried to show, he conducted himself with the greatest propriety. The only instance in which he is known to have recommended a line of policy at variance with uprightness, was occasioned by his profound anxieties for the prosperity of religion. The most of his coadjutors were at one time or other chargeable with serious inconsistencies, and many of them, overcome with the troubles they encountered, retired from the conflict; but, as Dr. M'Cree observes, "Knox never shrank from danger—never consulted his own ease or advantage—never entered into any compromise with the enemy—never was bribed or frightened into cowardly silence—but keeping his eye singly and steadily fixed on the advancement of religion and of liberty, supported throughout the character of the reformer of Scotland."

A. F.

ART. V.—SHOULD PRIMITIVE METHODISTS RECEIVE GOVERNMENT AID FOR THEIR DAY SCHOOLS?*

THE question here proposed for discussion is undoubtedly of great importance to us, as a religious community, at the present time. This question, which was somewhat fully brought before the Conference of 1866, will, according to its decision, have to be laid before the Conference of 1867; and in order that the Connexion may have an opportunity of expressing its opinion, the subject will be submitted to our next March Quarterly Meetings, and through them to the ensuing district meetings.

The design of this paper is to assist in some humble degree our official brethren in coming to a right decision on this important question. We address ourselves in the following remarks to those who stand identified with Primitive Methodism, and have no reference whatever to the exceptional classes called paupers and criminals. The importance of education is admitted, but the question comes back—by whom must it be conducted? Where does

* In our November number for 1866, an article appeared advocating the propriety and necessity of our Church accepting State Grants for Education. The article we now publish takes the opposite ground. It is right and fair that both sides of this important question should be heard.—EDITOR.

the responsibility rest? On this question there are conflicting opinions; but with regard to ourselves, as a religious body, we maintain that we are bound in this matter to submit to the word of God, not to parliamentary blue books, but to the Bible. Not to government school inspectors' reports, but to the Holy Scriptures. We confess that we have not unqualified confidence in blue books, but we have unwavering confidence in the Bible. We regard this not only as the foundation of our faith, but as the rule of our lives. Our relative duties are here distinctly pointed out, and perhaps no duty is more clearly indicated than the duty of parents to teach their children, and the obligation of children to submit to their instructions. The first command in the second table of the Law is, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." This command is first in morality, first in influence, and first with promise. In the Proverbs of Solomon there is no duty more solemnly impressed on the attention of children, than to hear and receive instructions from their parents. Here are a few selections: "My son, hear the instructions of thy father and forsake not the love of thy mother; they shall be an ornament of grace unto thy head and chains about thy neck." "Keep thy father's commandment and forsake not the law of thy mother." "A wise son heareth his father's instructions, but a scorner heareth not rebuke." Upon parents rests the responsibility of children's education, and it cannot be abrogated, nor superseded, nor transferred. Parents may employ a teacher to assist them in the education of their children, but it must be understood that the teacher is only a subordinate agent, the parent is the principal. The teacher does not remove from the parent any of the responsibility of his relations. Those who wish to pursue this argument may consult "Wayland's Moral Science," chap. 3, page 303, on "the law of parents," a book which our Conference has appointed as a text-book for our young ministers in the fourth year of their probation, and which we infer contains only such sentiments as that assembly wishes to be taught and practised in the connexion.

In opposition to what has now been advanced, both philosophers and statesmen from ancient times have asserted the main right of the State to educate the young. On this sentiment the institutions of Sparta by Lycurgus were founded. Plato in his Republic teaches the same principle. Aristotle supports it. Many distinguished men in more modern times have held similar sentiments to those enumerated; some that it is the duty of the government to educate entirely; others in part. And we must not forget to mention that infidelity ranges itself on the side of State education. Now, are the opinions of these men to be preferred to the institutions of the Bible? Is the authority of man to super-

sede the authority of God? As Primitive Methodists, we feel confident that we ought to stand, and that we shall stand firm for the institutions of the Bible, and the authority of God against the mere worldly wisdom of ancient or modern times.

The principal objection with many people against leaving the education of children to their parents is, the supposed unfitness of parents to select a proper teacher, and to chalk out a proper course of training. But it is certainly somewhat singular that this supposed unfitness should be restricted to this particular case. If parents are unfit to make a proper selection of a master to educate their children, would it not follow that they were equally unfit to select a doctor for them when unwell, or a lawyer to manage their affairs in a court of law when necessary? We think they are as capable of making a selection of the one as the other. Unfortunately the principle has gained ground of late that most things are best done by government; hence it is asserted that government can make the best selection of masters for schools, and also indicate the best course of education to be pursued. Now we want to know what there is in government that requires this function, or qualifies for it. It may not be improper to inquire what saith the Scriptures in reference to the duties of civil government. If it be that divine thing which many have described, its picture and model will, it may be presumed, be enshrined there. We read of the king who was to succeed the Theocracy, that when he sat upon the throne of his kingdom he should "write him a copy of the law and read therein all the days of his life, that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren," and that "he that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of the Lord." We also read that "rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil." None of these passages place a sceptre in the monarch's hand to educate the people, to sway the conscience, or subject the soul; all that this government has respect to is the overt acts of its subjects. Not the slightest intimation is given that it is responsible for the opinions of the people, and if it were we cannot see how it could perform its duty, in our own country, at the present time. The people are now the teachers of their rulers; opinion works upward from the lower to the higher classes of society; senates and statesmen perform the national will; scarcely ever does it happen that they are in advance of the public mind; from it rather they gather their information and regulate their decisions. The education of the people of a country cannot but be a very serious matter, and if a government claims to do this, we may surely be allowed to ask whence it derives its authority? In fact, the interferance of our government in this matter was begun by an Act which more than once has been denounced as *unconstitutional*, and *decidedly unjust* to a large portion of the people. Listen to the language of

Richard Cobden, in a speech delivered by him in the House of Commons, June 30th, 1854:—"Here was the Committee of Privy Council of its own accord, without consulting parliament, granting public money to which the voluntaries had contributed for purposes in which they could not partake, for it must be borne in mind that the voluntaries were excluded from these schools. It was impossible not to admit that this was unjust to the voluntaries, and contrary too to constitutional principles, for he really must say that it was going a little too far for the Privy Council to dispose of the public money in this manner." As to the injustice perpetrated by this Act, we maintain it condemns the whole action of government in the matter of Education. It is the bounden duty of government to be impartially just in all its dealings with the people, and if it attempts any duty that involves the smallest amount of injustice, it is perfectly clear that the thing ought not to be done. But we are very coolly told that to put an end to injustice in this case, each religious community should accept its proper share for educational purposes; that is, if the principle laid down in this paper be correct, we are all to do wrong, and then we shall be right. But we apprehend that when we are told that each religious community should take its proper share, it is at all events intended that we as a body should do so, whether other denominations do so or not, and thus by this join hands and strengthen those who, as Richard Cobben has shown, have been and are still acting unconstitutionally and unjustly. We hope our people will have more regard for the constitution of our country and the principles of eternal justice than act in such a manner.

But there are the religious bearings of the question which are undoubtedly of primary importance. It is said by those who are in favour of State aid for education, that the subject of religion ought not to be introduced into this controversy about education, as the two things are widely dissimilar, and to confound them in argument, as many appear to do, is a fruitful source of mistake. Now we maintain that it is not the opponents to State aid that bring forward the subject of religion, but it is the government itself, by insisting that religion shall be taught in the schools that receive aid from the public funds. That there may be no mistake on this matter, let us see what is the recently expressed opinion of the present Prime Minister, the Earl of Derby, on this subject, to a deputation appointed at a meeting held on the day following the conclusion of the Church of England Congress, held at York, on the subject, as was stated by the deputation, of the serious injury to popular education which has resulted from the practice of the educational department of the Privy Council in making the conscience clause a condition of building grants. After a lengthened conversation between his lordship and various members of the deputation, in the course of which, it having been clearly shown

that the principle of the conscience clause would admit of secular education, his lordship "*emphatically condemned any education without religion*," which he said was not sanctioned by parliament. Here is the unmistakable utterance of the present prime minister on the important subject, clearly stating that any education which the government would support must be religious. Now, allowing that secular education might be a subject of social arrangement, we maintain that religion never can. See Wayland's Moral Science," page 216, on religious liberty. If it be admitted that the government have a right to teach religion (and we cannot conceive how government grants can be received without admitting it), then a State Church must be right. It may be said that the Holy Scriptures are the only text book required by government, each denomination of Christians being allowed and expected to add elementary books, embodying its own doctrinal belief. But if parliament have a right to teach any portion of religion, it has a right to teach the whole; if it have a right to teach religion in the school it has a right to teach it in the chapel; if it have a right to teach religion to children, it has a right to teach adults, and thus the whole goes in support of the State Church system, which we consider to be anti-Scriptural and utterly indefencible. But in this case we have a professedly Protestant government teaching all the conflicting religious sentiments of those who may feel disposed to take its money, and in fact teaching the sentiments of a Church which is denounced in the homilies of the government church as a "foul, filthy, old withered harlot," in fact "as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen." Will our people join hands with such a confederacy? Will they for the sake of a little filthy lucre sacrifice the independent position they have occupied and do occupy? Let the Connexion rise higher in holy power and self-sacrifice, and then will our children be educated without grants of money from the State purse, or compromise of principle.

To some persons the interference of government in the education of the people does not seem to involve any serious evil; but no pretentions the State can put forth can contain so distinct a principle or means of tyranny. In the hands of unscrupulous, wicked men, the certain consequences are too fearful to think of. It is grasping the whole intellect of the country. It says in impious rivalry of the Father of Spirits, "All souls are mine." Its right being so far acknowledged, it knows no definite bounds. What shall be taught depends on its behest. A just consequence of its prerogative is the sensorship of the press. All literature it must control. Every expansion of opinion it must carefully watch. It stereotypes the nation's mind. The education being under government, it must never be directed against government. These are not improbable evils, though if they be only possible, the

sagacious and prudent should resist a principle which might be so applied. What then, it may be asked, should a government do in the matter of education? We reply, as a government, nothing—emphatically nothing; as to the individuals composing government, we answer, what every other man ought to do; let them be intelligent and religious themselves, and preserve a domestic discipline of education and religion; let their example, and even their council, recommend education and religion to the people; but we have an illustration which we borrow from the Bible, and this we would earnestly enforce. Would that all leaders and governors of nations might adopt and act upon the language of Joshua: "If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom you will serve; but as for me and my house we will serve the Lord."

But it is urged that other denominations are receiving government aid, and why not we? Why? Because it is wrong in principle and unjust in practice. Those denominations that receive government aid for education will also receive it for religion, and in this respect are at least consistent; and as to the Romish and Anglican Churches there has never been any difficulty in getting them to receive State aid; their language and conduct have always been crying, "Give, give;" and they are never satisfied. And we are sorry to say that the Wesleyans often display an eagerness after State patronage and support which we deeply deplore. But these Churches form no rule for our conduct; the very suggestion of adopting the Church of England, or of Rome, as a model for Primitive Methodists, should, we think, be at once repudiated. As to the Wesleyans we have been told, that we ought to lean more towards them than we have done, and that we have leaned too much towards the Baptists and Congregationalists. This is the fact, and it is easy to understand why a stronger sympathy has existed between us and the two denominations last named. When our early preachers were engaged in missioning the towns and villages of our country, and had to endure such merciless persecutions, the Baptists and Congregationalists were our friends, and often came to our rescue; hence the attachment. But now we are very coolly informed that it is quite time for us to transfer our attachment to other parties, especially so as we want government aid, and our old friends sternly refuse all such help. We have never been very desirous of leaning much on any arm of flesh; we think the best course is to ascertain what is the will of God, and then pray for grace to enable us to do his will. Still we like old tried friends, friends who stood by us in adversity, and we will not cut their acquaintance now because they still have Christian manliness sufficient to stand on their own legs without State support. But it may not be out of place to ask, in what direction our friends, to

whom we have to transfer our affections, are going? If reports are true, it is said they are leaning very much towards the Church of England, and it is an unquestionable fact, that the Church of England is inclining very much towards the Church of Rome; and our opinion of the Church of Rome is, that she is the worst of all systems bearing the Christian name—the masterpiece of the devil. Now, if these things be true, we had better pause, and examine our ground carefully before we transfer our affections or exchange our course of policy. We, as a religious community, have often been told that if we could only get money from the government we should gladly receive it; and we have as often said in reply, that we should not. Let us receive it now, and all that we have hitherto said and done will be remembered against us; our character for sincerity will be lost, we shall deserve to be reviled for our inconsistency; we shall be looked upon as the mummers of principle, and the swashers of conscience; we shall have stooped our necks to the yoke of the State.

But we are told that by refusing State aid for education we are losing our young people by thousands. This statement we regard as a mere assumption, residing only in the imagination of those who make it. We have not seen or heard of any evidence besides the mere "ipse dixit" of those that assert it. If what is stated be true, it is to be deplored; but we are not prepared to accept the statement, for if we are losing thousands by refusing State aid, then those who are receiving it are retaining thousands and gathering in the thousands we are losing. How many the Churches of England and Rome are getting by our losses we cannot say, but we should hope very few, if any. With the Wesleyans we can deal a little more definitely, as they report their numbers annually; and as they are so nearly related to us, especially in religious sentiment, we should suppose they would get the lion's share of our loss, so that with the thousands they preserve by the powerful assistance of State grants, and the numbers they get from us, in consequence of our refusing these grants, we should reasonably expect a very large increase reported by them. But how does the matter stand? The yearly increase reported at the last Conference was 356; and our Conference, without the assistance of the State, reported an increase for the year of 2,130. Let the facts speak for themselves.

But we are told that numbers of our people are actually receiving government aid by sending their children to schools supported by the State. In reply, we may just say, that in connection with all denominations there are persons who act inconsistently; some through not understanding the important principles involved, and others we fear from a love of money; but however inconsistently some individuals may act, it does not involve the Connexion. But

the argument is, that because a few individuals among us send their children to such schools, and thus receive indirectly State aid, we ought as a Connexion to receive it directly; or because a few act inconsistently, the whole denomination must do so likewise; as if by increasing the number of wrong doers it would make wrong right. We are sorry for the inconsistency, from whatever cause it may arise, and hope our people will try to inform themselves more fully on the important matters involved in this question, and we hope that greater consistency will soon be the result.

We earnestly commend the principles advocated in this paper to the serious attention of our people; compare them with the word of God, and if found in harmony with that infallible standard of truth, adopt them; do not compromise the principle of right for filthy lucre's sake. If we sacrifice principle for worldly expediency, we may expect painful results to follow. As a religious community, we have from our commencement been entirely free from the trammels of the State, and have acted entirely on the voluntary principle for instruction; and before we part from this principle there should be very powerful reasons produced, much more powerful indeed than any we have seen or heard yet. The Divine blessing has been richly poured down upon us as a people; our members have steadily increased, our chapel and school accommodation is rapidly increasing and improving, our people are wealthy compared with what they were twenty years ago; and ought we under these circumstances to depart from the principle of sustentation, which under God's blessing has been crowned with such glorious results? We hope better things. We cannot be brought to endorse the sentiment that we are so poor we cannot—or so covetous we will not—educate our own children. We can never think that we are prepared to sacrifice our independence for a government *dole*; for the paymaster is the real master all the world round. But it may be said if we don't like our schools to remain under government inspection after we have tried it, we can throw off our fetters, and again assert our independence by paying back to government the money we have received. It is more easy to make a statement of this sort than to carry it out. It will be found in fact a great difficulty to get free from your golden fetters when once on; at all events, we should advise none to try the experiment. As we are now free, let us remain so, and then in the great conflict which is fast approaching, we shall be able to appear on the arena with clean hands, and take our part without being legitimately subjected to reproach. Let us only dip our fingers in the State purse, and we shall be paralyzed and stand abashed and confounded in the presence of our enemies. Let the parents of our children be properly instructed in their duty to their offspring, and especially on the subject of mental and

moral education, that they may have an intelligent conception of their obligations and duty, and so form a proper estimate of the value of education, and the great advantages their children will have by being properly educated; and in pursuing this course we shall be carrying out the ordinance of God. There is no enactment that can dissolve parental responsibility in the education of their children, none which can transfer it. Listen to what the great Jehovah said to the ancestor of his ancient people: "For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the law, to do justice and judgment." This was to be the rule of transmission—"Teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons; the father to the children shall make known thy truth." No less explicit and authoritative is the Christian law: "Ye fathers, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Let no government inspection step in between you and your children, to select a teacher, or to mark the course of education to be pursued. Do not be bribed to submit to State control by an offer to bear part of the expense to educate your children. Honour the position that God has given you, and train up your children in the way they should go, and if you do so the blessing of the Most High shall rest upon you in time, and in the great day of reckoning the Judge will say to each and every parent, "Well and faithfully done; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

T. H.

ART. VI.—STRAUSS' NEW LIFE OF JESUS.

A New Life of Jesus. By DAVID F. STRAUSS. Two vols. London: Williams and Norgate.

THIS "New Life of Jesus" by Strauss is not likely to create a degree of interest equal to that produced by the publication of his "Critical Life of Jesus" some thirty years ago. The theory which he then advanced was in its main features somewhat novel, and to many minds appeared attractive and imposing. It was one of the boldest strokes that rationalistic hands had aimed at Christian truth; and while some feared that it might prove subversive of the faith, others rejoiced at the prospect of a destruction which they considered certain. Novelty, boldness, and an array of learned criticism, contributed for a time to attract attention to this work;

but a careful and searching criticism showed that the theory propounded in it was baseless, and thus removed at once the fears of the timid and destroyed the expectations of an extreme rationalism. This "New Life" is a tacit confession that the previous one has failed. It was written for the "theologians," for men of thought and learning, accustomed to deal with the subjects it discussed; but it has failed to make the impression upon them the author expected. When the mythical theory first shaped itself to his mind he seems to have been enamoured of it with all the fondness for which neophytes are remarkable, and to have thought that a statement of it would command almost general acquiescence. In this he has been disappointed; the theory has been freely handled, and its criticism severely criticised, and the result is, that the "theologians" have refused to accept it. The author, with the accustomed *liberality* of his school, attributes this to interested motives. The interval that has elapsed since the publication of his first work "has made it perfectly clear that professional theologians are precisely those from whom an unprejudiced judgment in these matters is least to be expected. They are in fact interested parties, adjudicating their own cause."* The imputation of mercenary motives is a serious fault in this work; it is unwarrantable arrogance for any person to assume that all nobleness and integrity are upon his side, and that his opponents are distinguished for nothing except meanness and hypocricy. It is surely quite possible for a man to maintain views at variance with the mythical hypothesis sincerely and honestly; but this Strauss is scarcely prepared to allow. Any discussion concerning the Christian faith, and the gospel records which form its basis, is, according to Strauss, considered by professional theologians "to imply a doubt as to the propriety of the estimation in which they are held as spiritual leaders." Truth is with them a very secondary thing; their position, emoluments, and privileges, are concerns of primary importance, for which they are prepared to sacrifice even the sacred interests of truth. Now, by what evidence are accusations so grave sustained? By none whatever. They are simply advanced—and advanced unsupported—to explain why men of undoubted learning and orthodox faith have not accepted his theory. In his opinion it is so simple, and its truth so evident, that had they not been blinded by interested motives they would have accepted it at once. Reasoning of this kind—if reasoning it may be called—originates either in knavery or folly; it is either designed to create and foster prejudice, and thus gain a point, in which case it proceeds from knavery, or it bespeaks a mind under singular hallucination, and thus emerges from folly.

* Preface, page 8.

Leaving the learned, Strauss now turns to the people, for whom this "New Life" has been expressly written. In his preface he intimates that the general public cannot now be considered unprepared for inquiries of this nature. This we admit; and this fact furnishes an explanation why this second "Life of Jesus" has produced little or no impression upon the public mind. The questions raised have been repeatedly debated, and all men of ordinary intelligence, accustomed in any degree to thought and reflection, have formed settled opinions respecting them; so that the present work does not appear under the circumstances which gave the previous work so much advantage. It is a gratifying fact that advancing intelligence gives Christianity firmer hold of the public mind, and renders its presence more influential in guiding the onward progress of humanity; so that, instead of becoming effete, worn-out, as a thing belonging to a condition of intellectual childishness, but unfit for the world's manhood, it is gathering strength and growing in importance by the very conditions it was predicted were to accomplish its overthrow. The advancing intelligence of the people presents the most formidable barrier to all such attacks upon the Christian faith as are contained in this work. Notwithstanding the little interest which this republication of the mythical theory has created, we propose to submit it to a brief examination, and endeavour to show that it is false in its philosophical principles and unfounded on fact.

The hypothesis maintained in this new discussion is substantially the same with that advanced by the author in his previous work, and the main principles of which he has defended in numerous essays published by him during the past thirty years. The theory is by no means an original one, for Woolston in the early part of last century advocated the mythical origin of many of the gospel narratives, and some continental writers have partially applied it to the New Testament; but Strauss was the first to reduce it to scientific form, and apply it generally to the gospels. A myth he explains as the production of the consciousness of a period, or of a community. It is not the production of a single man. It obtains expression through the medium of some particular person, but it does not originate with him, except in so far as he represents the general consciousness—the prevailing view of the community, or period. By this view, elaborated in his earlier work, Strauss conceived that he excluded, if not altogether, yet in great part, conscious and intentional fiction. But this view, though advanced in the present work, is considerably modified—perhaps it is not too much to say entirely invalidated—by other considerations. The Gospel narratives have defied the Straussian method. If not historical they must at least in great part be intentional fictions. This several writers belonging his own school have not failed to

point out. Two, at least, of the evangelists state that in several instances they witnessed what they record; now here there is no room for the idea of growth, no scope for the creation of a general consciousness or prevailing view; what is recorded must be either true or false, historical or intentional fiction. And hence "in this new discussion of the life of Jesus," writes Strauss, "I have mainly in consequence of Baur's hints allowed more room than before to the hypothesis of conscious and intentional fiction." And he further states in answer to a supposed inquiry,—"Whether the conscious fictions of an individual are properly to be called myths? Certainly, as soon as they have gained belief and passed into the legend of a people or a religious sect, for their having done so invariably shows at the same time that they were formed by their author not merely upon notions of his own, but in connection with the consciousness of a majority."* This is an exceedingly awkward attempt to preserve ground which is felt to be insecure. A myth is the embodiment of a common belief, or, as the author prefers to state it, a general consciousness. It is a narrative not produced by the deliberate intention of any particular person, and promulgated by him as true; but an account embodying in particular form what is commonly received, what all admit. Again, an intentional fiction, that is, a deliberate falsehood, when it gains general belief, may be called a myth. Now, how these opposite opinions respecting the nature and scope of myth may be reconciled, we presume not to say; one may be true, but we are unable to see how both can be admitted respecting the same subject. In the one case the general belief, the prevailing view produces the narrative called myth; in the other the story so called produces the belief; and it is mere subterfuge to say that the fact of its gaining general acceptance shows that it was connected "with the consciousness of a majority." Now what is the difference between the "consciousness of a majority" and the "general consciousness" to which the author refers? Does he wish to insinuate that there is no difference between the points of view he advances respecting myth—between a deliberate falshood advanced by a man for the purpose of producing certain views—and a narrative originating in and embodying a belief already existing? If he intends to persuade his readers that there is no radical difference between these points of view he presumes largely upon their credulity. A question may be reasonably proposed respecting the "general consciousness" with which Strauss connects the origin of myth. How is it produced? It will proceed from some cause or causes, and these its antecedents will have to be accounted for. An

* Vol. I., pages 213, 214.

inquiry pushed in this direction will be in no way favourable to the opinions of Dr. Strauss.

The Straussian hypothesis is the product of a pantheistic philosophy. Its author belongs to the Hegelian school, and he seeks by his philosophical principles to give to the mythical theory a scientific form. At the foundation of his speculations lies the impossibility of miracle. This he postulates as axiomatic, a position that cannot be questioned, and that carries along with it the evidence of its own truth. The order of nature is inviolable. Now to the axiomatic character of this postulate we take exception. It is a favourite phrase with a numerous class of writers, but it is a rather ambiguous expression, admitting at least of two widely different interpretations, and requiring a little explanation. It may be used in an all-inclusive sense, or in a sense but partially-inclusive; and it plays so important a part in all philosophic writing against miracles that we have a right to know in any particular instance in which of these senses it is used. Now this fact destroys its axiomatic character; instead of being a necessary and incontrovertible truth by which other truths may be illustrated and established, it requires to be illustrated and established itself. Does this phrase comprehend along with inanimate nature, all the activity of intellect, all the phenomena of will? If it does, then to maintain that miracles are an incredible disturbance of natural order, or indeed any disturbance at all, is just begging the question. Our experience, by which alone we gain our knowledge of the order of nature, is not of a character to support such a statement. What do we know of the order of nature in this its extensive but true acceptation? Absolutely nothing. What are called miracles may for anything we know, be but part of the order of things, however less common than others, just as certain convulsions, though occurring but seldom, enter into the order of natural things. Human experience in relation to the order of nature, in its all-inclusive sense is too limited to support any antecedent presumption against miracles.* If the phrase be accepted in a narrow sense—a sense excluding the phenomena of will, and confined to the operation of certain physical laws which philosophy has been able to arrange and classify, then miracle may indeed be regarded as an interference with the order of nature, not necessarily an interruption of it, but the operation within its sphere of a power extrinsical to it, and capable of controlling it. But understood in this limited sense it cannot be seriously maintained that it is impossible for the order of nature to be interfered with, for we are well aware that in numerous cases the operation of human will interferes with the course of physical law, as for instance, when

* See "Butler's Analogy," Part II., ch. ii.

a stone is hurled into the air, or when any physical phenomena are modified to please the fancy or serve the interest of man. Now if the order of nature be accepted in the partially-inclusive sense, there is even in human will a power not included in it capable of interfering with it and controlling it; so that the postulated impossibility resolves itself into a rather common occurrence, and if the more comprehensive sense be adopted then the objector renders it impossible to affirm the impossibility of miracle. Many writers on this question are singularly indefinite in the meaning they attach to the phrase, "order of nature." The late Baden Powell published a volume bearing this title, the object of which was to invalidate the miraculous element in Christianity. In this volume the writer's meaning is so ambiguous that in places it appears as if the spiritual was an extra-natural sphere, not comprehended in the "order of nature," while other arguments overawe us by the impressive thought that all being and all phenomena are included in one vast and comprehensive system, guided and governed by the Supreme Intelligence; and then again we are startled by the supposition that the Universal Reason, the Great Supreme, is but the order and harmony apparent in the universe as far as we know it, and which we feel convinced is supreme everywhere. This obscurity, and playing fast and loose with terms and phrases, is characteristic of Strauss, though he develops his philosophy with greater boldness than the Oxford professor, and leaves one less in doubt respecting his real meaning. This magic phrase, this rationalistic watchword requires definition. Strauss, and almost all writers of the various rationalistic schools, reason as if the supporters of miraculous intervention considered it something unnatural, having no essential connection with what is termed the order of nature, but as being something altogether beyond it, or else a sort of antagonistic act. Now, we venture to say that this is not a fair representation of orthodox opinion. Whatever has been the manner in which writers favouring miraculous intervention have expressed their opinions, the views with which they are credited by Strauss and other opponents cannot in fairness be attributed to them. Let this formula in which Strauss states what he deems a fundamental principle be explained—let it be definitely stated in what sense it has to be accepted, if in the all-inclusive sense, then the matter in dispute cannot be argued upon this ground, for there is nothing here but what the disputants on both sides admit. Accepted as all-inclusive, then there cannot an event occur uncomprehended in the order of nature, and the point at issue must be decided upon other ground. If the phrase be defined in its partially-inclusive sense, then intervention, similar in kind, if not equal in degree, to what is termed miraculous cannot be

denied, for its possibility and occurrence are both admitted in this definition of the rationalistic watchword.

Strauss is compelled by his philosophical views to accept his favourite phrase in its most comprehensive sense, for nature is to him but a process, and by consequence all-inclusive. Hence he is under the necessity of defending the assumed impossibility of miracle by reference to another favourite philosophical principle,—miracle is inconceivable. This is the principle developed in his section on the idea of miracle.* Miracle cannot be construed in human thought, man cannot comprehend its occurrence, and therefore it cannot occur. Human thought is the measure of possibility, the limitation of being. There is nothing transcending the reason of man, for in him reason realises its highest development. This Strauss does not say in so many words, but it is unquestionably the substance of what he advances. A very simple inquiry will seriously unsettle this imposing philosophic dogma, which invests human reason with such high prerogative. Does man admit and allow the existence of nothing but what he is capable of conceiving and comprehending? In this as in other instances an appeal to common sense furnishes an admirable corrective of unrestrained speculation. Men admit the incomprehensible, and refuse to recognise their limits of thought as the measure of what is. The pantheistic philosophy, to which this principle belongs, is itself the most incomprehensible of philosophies, and makes the most extravagant demands upon human credulity. It frequently, perhaps invariably, occurs that the greatest outcry against the credulity of believers in Christianity proceeds from those who manifest still greater credulity, at least it is so in this instance, for to assert that because an object or event cannot be comprehended, cannot be construed in thought, therefore the one cannot be, neither can the other occur, indicates a narrowness of view, a credulousness of mind that cannot be paralleled among believers in miraculous interference. Upon the ground which Strauss assumes it is as credulous to believe in an origin of things as it is to believe in miraculous intervention, for the one, to say the least, is as inconceivable as the other; but it is equally credulous to believe in an infinite succession of things, for this is as inconceivable as either the origin of things or miraculous intervention; yet one of these two positions, creation or infinite succession, must be true, and must be accepted. But as both are equally inconceivable it is equally credulous to accept either. What then are poor mortals to do if this principle be a true principle? They are fools for believing, and yet they cannot but believe. Poor human nature! its condition is pitiable indeed. But certainly a principle like

* Vol. I., page 195.

this, the absurdity of which may be demonstrated a thousand times over, is not the guide we ought to adopt in attempting to decide the highest problems in philosophy, and answer the questions of what is and what can be. This principle, which results in nothing but contradiction and disorder whenever and in relation to whatever it is applied, Strauss employs in the construction of history: "It is the problem of historical investigation, not merely to discover what has really taken place, but also the mode in which one thing has been caused by another. But history must renounce the latter most honourable part of her problem the moment she is ready to admit the existence of miracle, interrupting as it does the causation of one thing by another."* Here we have the gratuitous assumption introduced that miracle is unnatural or anti-natural. This, as we have before remarked, is a caricature of orthodox opinion. But respecting the substance of this quotation we venture again to appeal to plain matter-of-fact and common sense. Is this a true definition of the historian's work? Does nothing come within his province or find a place in his pages except what can be fully explained, adequately accounted for? The answer is obvious—history frequently fails to furnish a solution of what it records. The facts are stated, but the influences operating in human life are so diverse and complex that it is impossible to say in many instances in what way the phenomena recorded have been produced, and not unfrequently the very opposite of what might have been expected comes to pass. Caprice, prejudice, and other influences may be adverted to in explanation of an occurrence, but they furnish no explanation, as we speedily find out when we carefully examine what they really signify; they are only confessions of ignorance, admissions that the occurrences in question cannot be explained in accordance with what is usually understood as orderly succession. In almost all the phenomena of human life the causes are so occult that the explanations furnished are at most but conjectures founded upon inference and probability, and no two historians furnish exactly the same solution of the same problem, showing that the materials of history cannot always and absolutely be referred to any antecedent fact or circumstances for a full and adequate explanation; as a solution of the varying length of day and night can be furnished by reference to the inclination of the earth to the plane of its orbit, and its relative position to the sun. This latter phenomenon is explained by all scientific men in the same manner, but the phenomena of human life are differently explained by almost every man who undertakes the task. In the Straussian view of history there is a singular confusion of *what is* with *what it is* and *how it is*. The former

* Vol. I., page 197.

may be observed and recorded even though the observer cannot comprehend the latter.

In this section the author endeavours to show that miracle is inconsistent with all philosophy. Materialism is dismissed at once as affording no room for miracle. Pantheism is regarded as equally hostile. It recognises no God above and apart from nature. The laws of the universe are to it the essence of God, and the will of God is but the continued realization of that essence—that is if language of this sort admit of any explanation—the processes of nature constitute at once the nature and will of God, and hence miracle can have no place in pantheistic philosophy. Theism, the author allows, has popular forms which admit the possibility of miracle, but he maintains that philosophically miracles are excluded from this system the same as from the others. We do not purpose to enter into the various difficulties of philosophical theism, but would simply remark that in the observations of Strauss there are two fundamental positions of theism completely ignored, viz., the reality of both finite and infinite, and the universal rule and supervision of the Supreme One. These positions are essential to the very existence of theism, and in them is embraced the possibility of miracle, so that this possibility is not merely attached to certain popular forms of theism, but is embraced in the very foundations of theistic philosophy. *

Guided by the principles to which we have adverted, Strauss concludes that the evangelistic records are mythical. They are in great part the work of imagination, and not sober history, and by this hypothesis he endeavours to explain them. The falsity of his philosophical principles has been established, but we may remark in passing upon the viciousness of his method. His method is a direct violation of the inductive principle which is so generally acknowledged in modern inquiry. By the two or three principles propounded—principles evidently false—a theory is constructed and applied to explain the Gospel narratives. The facts are not candidly examined, and the theory of explanation formed by careful induction; but the theory is formed first and the records have to bend to it, reminding one of the old Ptolemaic astronomy with

* Theism, as Strauss represents it, is not theism. In the highest problems of philosophy theism appeals to faith and not to reason. It maintains the distinction between these two, and refuses to recognise man's power of conception as co-equal and co-extensive with his power to believe. What on account of the limitations of thought cannot be reconciled now, man may nevertheless believe is capable of reconciliation. That it cannot be done here is no reason why it can never be done. Strauss deals unfairly with philosophical theism, in fact makes it quite another thing when he quietly passes by the distinction between faith and reason, and omits to state that theism in the highest problems of philosophy appeals to the former and not to the latter.

its cycles, epi-cycles, and numerous other odd things by which it was attempted to explain the mechanism of the heavens; but the celestial phenomena would not group themselves at the philosopher's bidding so as to make good his speculations; neither in this instance can the facts of the case be explained by preformed theory. A careful induction of all the facts relating to the contents of these records, and their transmission to our times, may yield valuable results, but the Straussian method can only terminate in confusion and perplexity.

A strenuous endeavour is made to provide time for the production of these narratives according to the mythical hypothesis, and the evidence in favour of their antiquity has to be invalidated. This brings the inquiry into the region of fact, and we purpose showing that the Straussian hypothesis is without foundation here. Strauss begins by urging that it is quite a possible thing for books to pass under the names of persons who really never produced them, and refers us as to a case in point, to the life of St. Christopher, by Frischlin, which a short time ago was proved to have been not the work of Frischlin, but the production of a priest belonging to the district of Isenberg, in Hanau. It nevertheless appears that the imputed authorship originated in the fact of Frischlin editing and superintending the publication of the work. His connection with it was unquestionable, but the precise character of that connection the public did not know. Now this can scarcely be considered a case in point, for Strauss denies any such connection between the Evangelists and the books bearing their names as that which subsisted between Frischlin and the book attributed to him. But the possibility pleaded for granted, and what then? Why nothing. Possibility proves nothing apart from evidence of actual occurrence, and that an event of a given sort happened in one instance, in no wise renders it likely that a similar event may happen in another instance. Every occurrence is supported by evidence peculiarly its own, and bare possibility apart from evidence of particular occurrence decides nothing, and the evidence when sufficient renders it unnecessary to say much, if anything at all, respecting possibility, unless the possibility itself be questioned. Reasoning of this sort, under guise of fairness and thoroughness, is frequently employed to gender doubt and create prejudice, so that when the main question has to be discussed it is approached under prepossessions produced by subtle insinuations respecting possibility.

The manner in which Strauss manipulates the evidence for the early origin of the Gospels is characterised by a manifest unfairness; there is no subterfuge to which he does not resort in order to carry his point. These are grave charges, but they are easily substantiated. Eusebius, in his church history, has preserved certain testimonies concerning the Gospels furnished by Papias, who

was Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, during the early part of the second century. This bishop carefully collected the traditions of the Apostles from the old and venerable members of the Church, and he mentions gospels as written by Matthew and Mark. This testimony of course Strauss considers valueless; but it so happens that in the fragments handed down by Eusebius, Papias makes no mention of the gospel by John. Now this silence Strauss accepts as favouring the conclusion that the fourth gospel is of late origin. This method of dealing with the same witness is unfair; if his silence in this instance be worth anything his testimony in the other instances must also be of value, for silence depends for its significance and worth upon integrity and high moral character. If a man cannot be trusted when he speaks, his silence can be of no advantage to any cause. Eusebius, however, mentions Papias as citing the first Epistle of St. John, and it is almost a generally recognised result of biblical criticism, that the epistle and gospel are by the same author. The similarity in style, tone, and main ideas Strauss admits, but strives to invalidate the conclusion which inevitably follows from the citations in the Papian fragments, if oneness of authorship be conceded, by insinuating that this is perhaps not so certain, as the epistle lacks the vigour of the gospel and betrays greater weakness of mind, though in what respect he is careful enough not to say. Eusebius, he also supposes, may have merely concluded from certain similarities in expression that Papias cited the epistle, and this conclusion of his may have been entirely founded in mistake. Now all this is gratuitous—mere assumption—and it is not assumption but positive evidence that we need in a case like this.

Strauss complains that in the writings of the ancient fathers there should be manifest so little of the influence of the gospels, especially of the fourth. He thinks that if they had been of early origin all Christian writings would have been more strongly marked by evangelistic modes of thought and expression. Well, allowing this—how then does it happen that almost wherever there is reference to the gospel narrative in the patristic writings this critic refers it to the ecclesiastical language of the time—the results of certain floating traditions that agree more or less with our evangelical narratives? It is not possible to satisfy a carping, captious criticism like this, if indeed it be worthy of the name of criticism. Unless the writings of the fathers are replete with allusions and references to the gospels, it is evident that the gospels as we know them were of late origin; and should there be, as in some of them there is, and those among the most ancient, references to the gospel narratives, evangelistic modes of thought and forms of expression, then these proceed from a general tradition in the Christian community, from a sort of ecclesiastical consciousness, and are

after all but "superficial echoes." If this be rationalistic criticism, it may justly be characterised as slippery criticism; if one form of objection won't suit, another probably will; objection there must be, and like the chameleon this criticism is ever changing to suit circumstances. The extravagancies found in the works of the Church fathers are made the most of by Strauss. But if we were to grant that the fathers were as credulous as he would have us to believe, what then? Would the admission be of any service to him? The origin of the Christian Church and the sacred writings it possesses would still require explanation, and if the fathers on account of their credulity could not be admitted as witnesses for, they could not for the very same reason be allowed as witnesses against, so that they and their writings would be of no advantage whatever to rationalism. This more then anything else strikes us as unfair in rationalistic critics, that they admit in favour of their own views witnesses whose testimony they repudiate when advanced in favour of opposite views, and repudiate it either by the assertion of arbitrary principles, or by reference to credulity, weakness of understanding, prepossession, &c., reasons which if worth anything at all, will certainly prevent the men and their writings being of any service to rationalism in explaining the origin and progress of the Christian Church.

The Ignatian epistles Strauss dates not earlier than the middle of the second century. He states this as though it were well known and generally admitted; there is not a line of evidence furnished, nor a word of explanation given; the statement is boldly made and the desired conclusion follows. These epistles contain several citations in substantial agreement with our gospels. It is suggested that they proceeded from the ecclesiasticism of the times; but if this suggestion cannot be accepted, still they are not evidences of the early origin of our gospels, for the epistles in which they occur were not written till past the middle of the second century, and certainly if the canonical gospels had been in existence their influence would have been more marked in these epistles of Ignatius. Now the martyrdom of this illustrious father took place about A.D. 107, and the epistles—the genuineness of which Strauss does not question—were written a short time previous to his death, some of them probably during his journey between Antioch and Rome; so that instead of belonging to the latter half of the second century, they belong to the first decade, and were separated by a comparatively short space from the last of the canonical writings. The manner in which Strauss disposes of the evidence favouring the early origin of the gospels furnished in the ancient heretical writings is similar to that in which he disposes of the evidence furnished by the fathers. In the recently discovered Philosophumena attributed to Origen, but probably

written by some other person, there is a collection of extracts from various heretical writings reaching back to the third decade of the second century. Some of these extracts contain citations so plain that Strauss is compelled to admit that the authors were acquainted with our gospels. The force of this admission he endeavours to destroy by the sophistry of which he is such a consummate master. The extracts to which he gives special prominence are from an Ophitic work and from Basilides. The citations in the former he remarks are not of much moment, as we are ignorant of the age of the work in which they are found. But the point to which he gives special prominence is in fact of secondary importance. The Philosophumena were collected either at the close of the second or the beginning of the third century, and this writing of the Ophitic sects happens to have been well known then, so that at any rate we are compelled to refer its origin to about the middle or perhaps the first half of the second century. But the weakness of the Straussian sophistry is most apparent in the following extract:— "But when in the same work (that is the Philosophumena) it is said of the Gnostic Basilides 'and this says he is what is said in the gospels, that was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' (John i. 9). Basilides about 125 A.D. seems to have already known and recognised the gospel of John. But the formula of quotation, 'he says,' or 'says he,' in the Philosophumena of Origen is a very comprehensive one, as it also stands where no author at all, or where several have been named before. For instance, the description of the Gnostic system of the Valentinians is opened by the pseudo Origen with the words 'Valentine, and Heracleon, and Ptolemy, and their entire school say'; and then in the sequel he goes on, 'says he,' and 'say they' all mixed up together, so that we see that 'he' is that writer of a school whose work the author is just using at the time, but what writer, whether the founder, or one of his disciples and followers, we do not learn." * Now in the case which Strauss wishes here to invalidate the formula is connected with the name of Basilides, and refers to him alone, and how any man can conceive that some other person may be meant passes comprehension. And in the case of Valentine and his school there is never such confusion as prevents the connection of the formula being distinctly traced and precisely determined. This Basilidean difficulty is evidently an awkward one, for if it cannot be removed the Straussian fabric falls, hence the desperate effort to be rid of it at any cost. But a truce to this exposure of conjecture, subterfuge, and assumption; the Straussian criticism is suicidal; it is slain by its own hands.

We purpose now to furnish a brief synopsis of the external evi-

* Vol. I., pages 84, 85.

dence in favour of the antiquity, genuineness, and authenticity of the canonical gospels as contained in one of Tischendorf's latest works.* For convenience sake we adopt the following classification :—

First.—THE EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY THE FATHERS. Strauss admits "that towards the end of the second century after Christ the same four gospels as we still have are found recognised in the Church, and quoted in many ways as the writings of the apostles and disciples of apostles, whose names they bear, by the three most eminent ecclesiastical teachers—Irenæus in Gaul, Clement in Alexandria, and Tertullian in Carthage.† And to these may be added the author of the Muratorian canon, which probably dates from about A.D. 170. Here then we start from ground undisputed. To this same period belong the writings of Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, Dionysius of Corinth. And here may also be placed the apology of Athenagoras. This man was a teacher of philosophy in Athens, and while examining the Christian faith with a view the more effectually to oppose it, he became convinced of its truth, and pleaded in its favour; besides the apology bearing his name, he also wrote a work on the resurrection of the dead. Passing over nine years we reach the second apology of Justin Martyr, A.D. 161; and twenty-three years earlier, A.D. 138, his first apology was written. His dialogue dates about midway between the apologies. It may be remarked that Justin's second apology contains few references to the evangelistic writings; but the first apology and the dialogue abound with allusions and references to the gospel; and the general designation he applies to these records (APOMNEMONEUMATA—a narrative of memorable deeds—a collection of remarkable sayings—or more simply a historical narrative) renders it highly probable that their authority was fully recognised by the Church in his time. Polycarp's epistle to the Phillipian Church, written about A.D. 115, and the Ignatian epistles written about A.D. 106, in which there are allusions and references which indicate the existence of our gospels then, bring us to the opening decade of the second century.

Second.—THE EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY THE WRITINGS OF THE VARIOUS SECTS OF HERETICS. The sects to which reference will be made extend from the beginning of the second century to its close. Irenæus, in the last decades of this century, says that "the gospels are so firmly established that even the heretics are witnesses for them, and that every one starts from them in order to establish his doctrine." Now it is difficult to conceive how this could have been the case if the gospels had been only recognised about the middle of the century, in fact after some of the heretical

* See "Bibliothecra Sacra" for October 1866. † Vol. I., page 56.

writings to which Irenæus refers had been produced. The Montanistic sect, which flourished during the latter half of the second century, was largely dependent for its system of doctrine upon the fourth gospel. Marcion and the later Valentinians, belonging probably to about the middle of the century, acknowledged the existence of our gospels, for Marcion presumed to amend them, and Heracleon the Valentinian wrote a commentary on John. Tertullian mentions this in his writings against Marcion, and in his animadversions on the Valentinian system. Strauss disposes of this by aspersing the character of Tertullian as a careful investigator of facts, and questioning his competency to deliver a judgment in the case: a favourite mode of argument this with Strauss as with many others: when they can do nothing else they can fling dirt. The Naassenes and the Peratai, two ancient Ophitic sects belonging to the first half of the second century, support their doctrines by citations from the gospels. Matt. vii. 13, 14; John i. 1-4; iii. 14; viii. 44: may be named as occurring along with other quotations. The early Valentinian system, which belongs probably to the third decade of the century, is little more than evangelistic thought adapted to the forms of the Alexandrian and Eastern philosophy. And the same may almost be said of the theory of Basilides. We are thus brought again to the early part of the second century, at which time it appears the gospels were not only known, but had established themselves in the Church as authorities, so much so that every man endeavoured to obtain their support in propounding his opinions.*

Third.—THE EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY WRITINGS IN OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY. About the middle of the second century Celsus wrote his work against Christianity. Portions of this work have been preserved and handed down to our times in the writings of Origen; from these it is evident that the materials he principally used in his attempted subversion of the Christian faith were taken from our gospels. The circumstances of the resurrection — the thirst of Jesus upon the cross—the agony in the garden—and a number of other particulars related in the gospels, he endeavours to invalidate. These particulars he did not learn from tradition, for he states that he had taken them from the acknowledged and authoritative Christian writings, distinguishing between these and other writings to which he says he might have referred. Now it is rather remarkable that Strauss makes no reference to Celsus, and especially as the heathen opponent of Christianity lays some stress upon the superstitiousness of his times, a rather favourite Straussian idea. This silence is significant, and appears to admit of ex-

* The evidence furnished thus far may also be found in "Neander's Church History," Torrey's translation, vol. II.

planation only on the ground that to have referred to this ancient antagonist of the Christian faith would have sapped the foundations of the mythical hypothesis. It is a cardinal point with Strauss that the gospels in their present form did not exist until the middle of the second century. But at that time, and probably earlier, Celsus speaks of them as authorities in the churches generally received and commonly acknowledged, to the exclusion of other writings, and there is not in his work the slightest hint that he ever suspected them to be fabrications. Here then, by the witness of an adversary, the early origin of the gospels is established against the Straussian theory.

Fourth—THE EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS. Tischendorf, by his extensive researches and careful collation of manuscripts, has placed it beyond question that the Proto-evangelium of Jacobi and the Acta Pilati* were composed during the first decades of the second century, and that the writings now known by these names are substantially identical with the original writings as used by Justin Martyr and Tertullian. Justin, in his first apology, refers to these two apocryphal writings as common and well known in his time, and it hence follows that they must have been written early in the century. In these apocryphal books there are evident references to the Synoptists and to John, showing that our gospels preceded them, and were recognised as authorities in the Church when these apocrypha were produced. By this evidence it appears that the four Gospels of the New Testament were extant at the close of the first century. A further argument in favour of the canonical gospels may be based upon the general character of the apocryphal writings. "The great contrast of the latter to the former in form and substance, in language and thought, in conception and treatment, bears testimony for the holy origin of our canonical gospels, compared with which the apocryphal writings appear like the last limping followers of an army."

Fifth.—THE EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY TEXTUAL CRITICISM. In this department Tischendorf stands unequalled. His extensive and accurate erudition, together with his diligent collation of all available manuscripts, place any conclusion to which he may come respecting the sacred text almost beyond question. The old Itala, the earliest Latin version of the gospels, was made shortly after the middle of the second century. This appears from the writings of Irenæus and Tertullian, who wrote just before the close of that century, and with whose writings the oldest documents of the Itala text agree. The Codex Sinaiticus, discovered by Tischendorf himself, furnishes a further result. The Sinaitic text, which all com-

* These are selected as being about the most ancient.

petent scholars refer to about the middle of the third century, exhibits so striking an affinity to the old Itala that it must be in substantial agreement with the text from which the Latin version was made. And that this text was not of an isolated character is evident from the agreement between the Sinaitic text—the ancient Syriac text of the Nitrian manuscripts, and the texts of the earliest fathers. There is another point of importance worth remarking here. Recent researches place it beyond doubt that the Syrian version, known as the Peschito, and commonly referred to the close of the second century, pre-supposes the existence of the Nitrian text, so that this latter translation in its original form must have been made about the same time as the old Itala. There is then established this very important fact, that at about the middle of the second century—at the time Strauss says the gospels were produced in their present form—they were translated into Latin and Syriac, as the recognised and authoritative records of the life of Jesus, to the exclusion of all other writings. Another and most important result of textual criticism is, that previous to the middle of the second century there was a rich gospel text-history—a text-history which refers the evangelical canon to at least the end of the first century.

We have now accomplished our purpose, and shown that the mythical theory is false in its philosophical principles, and unfounded in fact; it requires nothing beyond this to explode this figment of fancy and prejudice; but in conclusion the following general observations may perhaps not be out of place. Strauss styles his work a "Life of Jesus," and in it he furnishes what he conceives to be a true history of the Prophet of Nazareth. The materials for this historical outline he draws from the gospels. Now we venture to submit that he has no guarantee according to his own theory for the truth of what he accepts as veritable history. The second volume of his work is intended to show how false the writers of the gospels were, saying that they saw what they did not see, and fabricating all sorts of stories for the purpose of investing Jesus with Messianic dignity. Now men so devoid of all regard for truth are not to be trusted on their own word alone. There must be contemporary testimony, but such testimony the author does not produce, but proceeds to make selections according to his fancy from these records, which by his own showing—if he have shown anything at all—are full of conscious and intentional fiction. The very ground he assumes prevents the accomplishment of the task he has undertaken—the construction of a "Life of Jesus." In other biographies where the miraculous element is found, it occupies but a comparatively small space, and stands to the main narrative rather in an accidental than an essential relation. But the case is different with the gospels. The life of

Jesus is altogether a miraculous life. This element constitutes the very pith and marrow of the narrative. To deny here is nothing less than to repudiate the writings altogether. Hence Strauss by the position he assumes deprives himself of the only sources whence materials for a "Life of Jesus" can be obtained. His criticism, however potent it may be to destroy, is unable to construct. True and genuine criticism is as able to construct as to destroy, and that the criticism of Strauss lacks this double power conclusively proves it to be a false criticism.

This hypothesis fails to show how these narratives pronounced mythical came to be received as statements of fact by the opponents of Christianity. Celsus, who wrote about the time to which Strauss refers the origin of the gospels, never even hints that the narratives were fictitious. He refers the facts recorded to magic and imposture, but never says that they did not take place, or at least appear to take place in the presence of the witnesses reporting them. The Jews also never disputed the facts, they sought to explain them, but never attributed them to fiction, a method of all others the most easy then, if these accounts had been the result of fabrication. The Christian faith came into early collision with Judaism, and it is incumbent upon Strauss to show how it happened that the miraculous events reported to be connected with its origin and early progress were never exposed as mere inventions by its first antagonists. It is not merely the belief of Christians that has to be accounted for, but the belief of anti-Christians; for the facts were admitted as fully on the one side as the other, the difference lay in the methods of explanation. This part of his task, and in our judgment a very important part, Strauss never directly touches; probably he found it would be inconvenient to do so.

The method of explanation adopted in these volumes is devoid of all naturalness. We furnish an instance, and that not the worst by far. In the gospels it is recorded that Christ was betrayed into the hands of his enemies by one of his disciples, and that after the betrayal the life of this disciple was suddenly and violently terminated. Strauss explains the origin of this narrative in the following manner. David, the favourite king of Israel, was regarded in many respects as representative of the Messiah whom the Jews expected. Now David was on one occasion betrayed by his intimate friend and counsellor, and to sustain the Messianic character, Jesus must be betrayed similarly. Achitophel, the traitor, when his scheme failed, "gat him home and hanged himself," and the traitor Judas, must terminate his life in a similar way, and hence the story. The authors of the gospels seem to have ransacked the Old Testament for remote references and indistinct allusions, as well as for the main features in the lives of the prin-

cipal prophets and kings, and out of the whole variously combined to have constructed the myths their writings contain. Now we may remark that this is strained and artificial; but even if accepted as an adequate explanation, constructions of this kind would require an intellectual acuteness and critical discrimination such as Strauss is not prepared to allow to the period in which he supposes the gospels to have originated; for he considers it to have been destitute of the critical faculty altogether. There is no attempt to show how these positions may be reconciled, and yet it seems that this mythical hypothesis requires the absence of the critical faculty on the one hand, and on the other its existence in a state of tolerably advanced culture.

The mythical hypothesis is so full of contradiction, so opposed to the spirit and principles of genuine criticism, that the man who adopts it has little reason to complain of the credulity of Christians. It is now more obvious than ever that there is no resting place between the acceptance and rejection of the gospels, and there appears to be a growing conviction that to accept them is less credulous than to reject them, and the only reasonable course a man can take. "There was a time when Teller's Lexicon was admired and esteemed by many contemporaries, as much as Teller's annuals are now. There was a time when the way in which Paulus endeavoured to bring the consciousness of the age into harmony with the writings of the New Testament was lauded as unparalleled in its acuteness. There was a time when Strauss's mythical hypothesis appeared to shake the foundations of the world. But now Teller is laughed at; at the name of Paulus, men shrug their shoulders; Strauss's mythical hypothesis has been quietly laid aside as useless by the most kindred spirit,* to make room for the hypothesis of a pious fraud. The time will come when men will not merely laugh but shudder at such an hypothesis as this." †

A. J.

* Baur. † "Ebrard's Gospel History."

ART. VII.—THE ORATOR.

IN what does oratory consist? An examination of a number of passages, all allowed to be historical, so as to see what quality they have in common, in spite of their differences, or, better still, a study of any living specimens of the orator that may be within reach will suggest a certain rough approach to an answer. All genuine specimens of oratory, it will be found, in whatever else they may differ, are characterised by a certain energy, or impressiveness, or force, or warmth, the exact cause of which it may be difficult to detect; and so, also, all genuine orators will be found to exhibit a certain energy, or fervour, or vehemence of character—let us even call it perturbability, or capacity of being roused and agitated. It is precisely the presence or the absence of this element that creates the feeling of difference between a mere fluent speaker and the man whom we recognise as an orator. Vehemence, power of being personally agitated in the act of agitating others—this, whatever smoothness and grace and dignity may be superinduced upon it by art, will be found to constitute the peculiarity of orators.

There is no doubt that, if our physiology were sufficiently advanced, this peculiarity would be found to be connected with certain arrangements of the physical constitution. While in the artist the passive sensibilities may predominate, or the passive sensibilities in association with select intellectual processes; while the pure thinker, again, is constituted for calm persevering reflection within himself; in the orator, whether the original stimulus came from within or without, the habitual rush of the being will be along the nerves of action and motion in the direction of the outer world—with perhaps (in order to distinguish him from the practical man, who is the same so far), a special determination of the energy towards the organs of speech. Somehow or other, at all events, the body of the orator *is* concerned in what he does. Standing before his audience, the orator is not merely a voice uttering words and ideas; he is a mass of intensely excited nerve acting, like a charged battery, on the aggregate vitality of his audience while they are individually receiving his words and ideas. The very law of human nature on which oratory depends is, that ideas dropped into the mind when it is in a state of excitement, take a firmer hold of that mind, and are more instantaneously and permanently diffused through it, for better or worse, as the case may be, than when it is in its natural and ordinary mood. Now, though there are various ways in which the mind may be excited, so as thus

to increase its tenderness and permeability to ideas, one of the most effective is simple collocation with other minds in an assembly or audience. It is all nonsense to speak of an audience as being simply a collection of individuals; meaning by that, that the audience can have nothing more in it than pre-existed in the individuals separately. Let a thousand individuals meet in the same hall, and, more particularly, let them meet genially and for the purpose of seeing some spectacle, or listening to some harangue, and, after a little while, electric circuits are established amongst them, and they are formed into a collective organism having a certain common consciousness, and exhibiting phenomena not belonging to the individual. Of course, in the case of the presence of individuals hostile to the spirit of the assembly and contemptuous of its proceedings, and also in the case of the division of a meeting into opposed factions, there are corresponding variations in the phenomena presented; but still, essentially, the fact of congregation brings with it a set of conditions alien to the experience of the individuals when isolated. Hence part of that force which attends on exhibitions of oratory is actually supplied, not by the speaker, but by the audience itself; and, the larger the audience, and the more exciting the circumstances in which they have met, the more there is of this already accumulated fund of power waiting for the orator's use, and, though independent of him in its origin, yet, in the effect, to go to his credit. But for the power to become apparent, nay also partly for its generation, the orator must be there; and it is the very definition of the man who professes to be an orator that he shall be in his own nature a man meeting the enthusiasm of the waiting crowd with a like enthusiasm of his own which shall receive it, evoke it, mingle with it, madden it, reverberate it, master it. Such men there are; and it is a grand sight to see them as they command a crowd. It is clear that, corporeally as well as mentally, or mentally because corporeally, they are in pre-established harmony with the conditions presented by an assemblage of their fellow-beings. Gradually, as they speak, they glow, they wax fervid; the audience acts upon them, and they react upon the audience; and they stand at last a visibly agitated mass of nervous force swaying the sea of heads beneath them, not by their voice and words alone, but by a positive physiological effluence or attraction. Among recent British orators, Chalmers was an extraordinary example of this power of sheerly physiological action which distinguishes the born orator from the merely cultivated speaker. He was a man of large and heavy build, whose demeanour, when he was not himself speaking, was so far from being fidgetty or excitable, that he sat like a mass of stone, perfectly placid and unperturbed, either not moving his head at all, or moving it slowly round as if it turned on a weighty pivot. All the

more impressive was it to see this heavy frame under the influence of the oratorical agitation. How the whole man was moved while he moved others! It was not speech; it was phrenzy. Even on lesser occasions, when he still kept within bounds, it was plain that in hearing him the audience was subjected not merely to the influence of his meaning, but to the influence also of the sheer physical excitement which accompanied his own sense of that meaning. And on greater occasions the sight was absolutely terrible. His heavy frame was convulsed; his face flushed and grew Pythic; the veins in his forehead and neck stood out like cordage; his voice pealed or reached to a shriek; foam flew from his mouth in flakes; he hung over his audience almost menacing them with his shaking fist; or he stood erect, maniacal and stamping. More than once after such an exhibition, there were fears of apoplexy; and once he lay for three hours on a sofa, having his head laved with vinegar, before sufficiently recovering himself. And often, when one remembered and carried away the exact words spoken by him in one of these phrenzies, they would seem plain enough, and such as any one else might have delivered without any approach to the same state of fury. Once, for example, when his agitation was at the uttermost, the sentiment which he was expressing was simply this—that if the landed aristocracy of the country did not pay heed to certain social tendencies, the importance of which he had been expounding, "their estates were not worth ten years' purchase." Here was a notion, here were words, which could have been spoken by any hardheaded man, or any quiet thinker who had anyhow got them into his head, and which certainly, if spoken by such a person, might have been spoken calmly; so that clearly the oratorical fury with which they came from the lips of Chalmers depended on a constitutional peculiarity—that peculiarity being an unusual amount of emotional and nervous perturbability in association with his thoughts and feelings, whatever they were. Perhaps, indeed, the intensity with which a notion or sentiment is felt, is measured always and in all persons by the degree in which it affects the nervous or bodily system, so that universally the oratorical perturbability might be supposed to be founded on personal earnestness of character. It was so, at least, in Dr. Chalmers —a man earnest to the core, and who felt in social matters as powerfully and painfully as most men do in matters of mere private and domestic concern. But no such general rule could be laid down without limitations and exceptions. On the one hand, there are examples of oratorical perturbability (though not the highest) where deep personal earnestness is deficient—cases in which oratorical power seems to depend on a sort of factitious or simulated earnestness coming in the act of speech and vanishing when it is over; and in which, therefore, all that can be asserted is

the man's perturbability to his own passing conceptions. On the other hand, we have personal earnestness, and even susceptibility to impressions and feelings to the degree of physical agitation and suffering, where there is an absence of the oratorical faculty. For the present, therefore, all that we need say is that a certain *kind* of perturbability, a certain visible co-operation of body and manner with mind and purpose, does characterize the orator.

Vague as this is, it serves to explain a good deal. It serves to explain, for example, the well-known fact that many great orations —that is, orations, the effect of which we know to have been prodigious—seem poor enough when they are read in print. Whitfield's reported sermons are often cited as an instance; and we have already stated it as our belief, that even the great political speeches of the parliamentary era of Fox and Pitt cannot now be read with any pleasure equivalent to their reputation. It was Fox's own maxim, indeed, that if a speech read well, it must have been a bad speech. The maxim, with all deference to so great an authority, is not true. Fine propositions are imperishable: those speeches, therefore, will survive, and will bear reading, in which there has been good and noble intellectual matter, not to speak of poetry; and that intellectual excellence in the matter of a speech, and that, too, of rare kinds, may consist with the highest oratorical effect in its delivery, is sufficiently proved by such examples as Demosthenes, Burke, Chalmers, and Kossuth. But the remark of Fox is certainly valid to this extent—that very generally, when speeches are read in print after their delivery, the virtue seems to have gone out of them. Nay, more, often when speeches do seem to preserve their virtue, so that they affect and delight the reader, it is not specially the *oratorical* virtue that they preserve, but some other. In reading, for instance, the severe, terse sense of Demosthenes, one may be astonished and delighted, and yet (unless one is a bit of an orator oneself) be puzzled to find out where the extraordinary eloquence lies. The reason is plain. The reader is not under the magnetic battery of the orator's excited presence. The meaning comes to him without the accompanying physiological action which sent it trembling through the very veins of the original auditors. Some speeches, in fact, consist of intellectual rubbish, or, what is little better, sent home by intense physiological action, just as sand and gravel might be discharged from a cannon: consequently, when the physiological action is wanting, what remains is only the intellectual rubbish. In the speeches of Demosthenes, on the other hand, what remains is splendid Athenian sense—propositions linked together logically, like pellets of polished steel. These we may and do admire; but, to understand the Demosthenic oratory, we must fancy the unparalleled intensity of physiological action with which these were delivered into the hearts and brains of the

Athenians. Save that the Athenians were a finical people, and would not tolerate the Fifeshire dialect, nor any except the most exquisite accuracy of pronunciation in their orators; Demosthenes, in respect of energy in the act of delivery, must have been an Athenian Chalmers. Apart from his own celebrated saying about 'Action, action, action,' this seems to be proved by the very tradition of his physical uncouthness at first, and of the natural difficulties of utterance he had to overcome. According to our observation, a certain difficulty of movement about the organs of speech is not an unfrequent characteristic of the orator. Extreme physical facility in speech we should regard as a bad sign—a certain whale-like movement of the jaw, or even a tendency to stutter, as a good one. The *os magna sonaturum* cannot be one that moves easily and with glib rapidity. Fox was not a fluent speaker, in the ordinary sense; he stood on the floor of the House, like a swarthy, thick-necked Norfolkshire farmer, his meaning sometimes gurgling to his mouth faster than he could utter it, in his excitement, and then ejected in intermittent bursts. Had Demosthenes been an Englishman or a Scotchman, he might have begun practice at once; but the Athenians, being a finical people, made him put pebbles in his mouth till he had added ease to his energy. Still, that which was the source of his power must to the end have been his constitutional quality of vehemence. As we read his speeches we cannot but admire, and admire greatly; but in completing our conception of him as the living Greek,

> 'whose resistless eloquence
> Wielded at will that fierce democracy,'

we must take into account, as something altogether tremendous, the effect of the breathing and agitated personality of the man as he paused, or recoiled, or pointed with his quivering finger, charging, as it were, with a distinct shock out of his own nerve and being, each winged and ringing sentence as it passed from his lips.

But something more definite seems yet desirable. Excitability, perturbability, a sympathetic co-operation of the body with the mind in the act of utterance, is, undoubtedly, the characteristic of the orator. There may, however, be excitability and perturbability enough where there is no oratory; and we have farther to inquire what is the *kind* of perturbability that constitutes the true oratorical vehemence. Now, at first sight, it is plain that the perturbability must not be of the incapacitating kind. The orator must be a man whom his own agitation rouses intellectually. He must be a man, so to speak, who cogitates best under those very conditions of nervous excitement which would para-

lyze other men. To say this, indeed, is but to state an identical proposition. To say that a man is a born orator, is but to say that he is a man so constituted as to be at his best under the conditions of oratory—*i.e.*, standing up in a hall, with a crowd before him expecting what he is to say. These conditions are certainly exciting. No man can be in them, however much accustomed to them, without feeling a change or elevation of mood to a pitch corresponding. As there is such a thing as a battle-fever, the effects of which, according to Goethe's memorable description of it from his own experience, is to make the person subject to it see everything as with brown eyes through a brown atmosphere, so there is such a thing as a platform-fever, the special character of which we leave it to some competent authority to describe. Veteran soldiers may get over the battle-fever, so that in the end they will tramp forward amid the whistling bullets without experiencing the optical illusion referred to by Goethe; and so, also, veteran orators get over the platform-fever. But *some* feeling corresponding with the situation will remain even with the veterans. The old soldier may seem to walk into the battle cool and collected; but under that cool and collected mien there is already rampant the fighting devil. And so even with the most practised and the most seemingly *nonchalant* of orators. Crassus, one of the speakers in Cicero's *Dialogue on Oratory*, and himself represented there as among the greatest orators of his time, not only avows his liking for those orators who show some perturbation in the beginning of their speeches, but maintains that, whether it is shown or not, the perturbation always exists. Speaking for himself, and also for his auditors, three of whom are also orators, he says, 'What I often observe in you I very frequently experience in myself, that I turn pale in the outset of my speech, and feel a tremor through my whole thoughts, as it were, and limbs.' Crassus confesses that, in his case, the disturbing emotion was most frequently that of fear. This, however, is not essential. It is enough that the full sensation of the situation is present, whether the form it takes is that of fear, that of triumph, or any other. In any case, the feeling may be said to be one of excitement or perturbation. Here, therefore, comes the peculiarity of the orator. As the born soldier is the man who, while the battle-field fever is on him, in whatever degree he may be subject to it, is not thereby incapacitated for his work, but is rather wound up for its perfect and exact fulfilment, so the born orator is the man on whom the platform-fever, in whatever degree he is liable to it, takes a similar effect. In other words, that man is by constitution an orator who becomes recollective and inventive in the act of becoming excited; with whom the peculiar agitation attending

the conditions of public speech is a necessary, or, at all events, an appropriate stimulus to intellectual activity and productiveness. This or something equivalent to this, will be found to answer as a definition. Popularly speaking, the orator is a man who does not lose himself as he becomes excited, but who, the more phrenzied he waxes, grows in the same degree the more shrewd, the more perfect in his command of all his faculties. Speaking more scientifically, the orator is a man who can never cogitate better than when he is agitated. That there are such men, no one can doubt. Placed before an audience, the majority of men become helpless and foolish: what sense or wit they have forsakes them, often carrying memory, and grammar, and the very power of coherent articulation, along with it. But there are others who positively outdo themselves when they are placed in the same circumstances; who seem as if they had found their element, and who move in it in a way to surprise themselves and others; in whom the excitement of speaking, so far from numbing their various faculties, seems to evoke some for the first time, and to make all more nimble and alert—memory, wit, fancy, imagination, speculative intellect, and even judgment and critical taste, simultaneously. They positively become more cool, more shrewd and subtle, and more self-possessed, less apt to blunder, as they become more fervid. There are many common proverbs and observations respecting orators which in reality embody this theory. When some one jocosely defined an orator as "a man who can speak nonsense till sense comes," the definition, though satirical, was scientifically accurate. When another—an American orator, we believe—declared that he "never could make a speech without first making a few remarks," he said substantially the same thing. But perhaps the finest recognition of the notion, as we have been expounding it, is that contained in a very happy phrase, used by some ancient writer on rhetoric—we think by Quintilian, *Clarescit urendo*, "He grows clear by burning," is the phrase in question; used, too, if we remember aright, precisely in reference to the orator. Whether it was originally so used or not, it suits him well. The orator is emphatically the man who, *clarescit urendo*, is clearest when he is most fervid, shrewdest when he is most excited, universally most capable when he is in the highest state of oratorical paroxysm.

British Quarterly Review.

THE

CHRISTIAN AMBASSADOR

ART. I.—PERSONAL ELECTION.

"HE that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." Such is the epitome of the gospel, the summary expression of Divine mercy and justice with respect to the hearers of the gospel. It is the solemn and immutable decree of God, the plan of grace formed in favour of the children of Adam. This decree comprises the grounds both of the salvation and the perdition of men. The elect are saved first, because God has given his Son and bestowed his grace, and secondly, because they have believed. Evidently faith is indispensable, since none are saved before they believe; and reprobates are lost because they despise the gift of his Son and the offers of his grace. This decree then is, properly speaking, the law by which men will be judged. Jno. iii. 18. Now, since this law, emanating from a just Legislator, gives an eternity of happiness to its observers, and an eternity of suffering to its violators, as it is by it that the last judgment will be pronounced, it implies on the part of those to whom it is given, liberty not to believe and capacity to believe. There is then in every man, it matters little how he came by it, a power to believe, because he will be absolved or condemned according as he will or will not have believed. Every man is therefore capable of believing, seeing that the righteous Judge can punish no one for his not having done what he could not, nor reward him for his having done what he could not but do. Faith is then the great law of the gospel. It includes all others, and by the fulfilment of it all are fulfilled. It is the basis upon which particular Churches and the general Church are established. Whosoever believes is a member of the true Church, and believers only enter its bosom. Thus the condition of admission into the invisible Church is faith. God makes choice of all those who believe to make of them the mystical body of his Son, their head; their faith distinguishes them from the rest

of mankind. They become the chosen, the elect of God. A who are in the Church have a right to this title, and it belongs none other. Whatever may afterwards transpire in relation those who are outside the Church, they are not the chosen of Go seeing the choice is made through faith, and they are not t possessors of faith. Election is then the setting apart of certa individuals, separated from the world, to be the Church of Go Believers only are subjects of this election, and it never tak place but when faith exists. Our attention shall be directed the nature, the time, and condition of personal election.

As we understand it, the election of grace is the choice of those who believe. It takes place at the moment a man believ and is conditional, seeing it is made only on the condition of fai Calvinistic election includes three views directly opposed to the It is the choice of a certain number of men which can neither augmented nor diminished. It is made from all eternity and unconditional. To discuss this question advantageously, t meaning of the term election must be distinctly apprehended a fully established. The question is not a doubt as to the reality election and the elect. That is not denied. We acknowledge t the words "elect of God," "chosen in Christ," "elect according the fore-knowledge of God the Father," indicate an act of gra in favour of certain persons considered individually and applyi in general to all believers in Christ. We shall find the nature personal election clearly given in the two following passages o Scripture. It is explained negatively by our Lord, when he said to his disciples, "I have chosen you out of the world," and positively by Paul, when he wrote to the Thessalonians that "God had from the beginning chosen them to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." All those texts of Scripture wherein the subject is the elect and election, and which do not treat of collective election or of election to special services, agree with the definition which has been given. "Many are called but few are chosen." Many are called to faith, but as many refuse the call, only those who obey by believing are chosen,—elected for divine adoption and eternal life. Many are called to believe, but there are few believers. "Put on as elect of God, bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind," &c., &c., which are invariably fruits of the Spirit,—believers being always humble, kind, and merciful. "Make your election sure;" God having chosen you by faith to obedience, that your faith might increase, so that your election might be increasingly sure. "But for the elect's sake, those days shall be shortened,"—those of believers whom he has chosen to be his children, and whom as such he loves with a peculiar love. "The elder unto the elect lady,"—to a believing lady. "Paul, an apostle according to the faith of God's elect,"—the faith

of believers. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?"—believers to whom there is now no condemnation.

According to the system which we combat, election is not the choice of those who believe in Christ, "It is the eternal choice of a certain number of men, not upon foresight of faith or of any other good quality or disposition.* Faith is thus the consequence of election; those who are elected, are elected to believe. This is an inversion of the Scripture method, which represents elections as the consequence of faith.

If we examine only the passages already cited on the hypothesis that election is the eternal choice of a certain number of men, we shall find it difficult to reconcile these passages with this definition.

1. Those who compose this certain number are elected before they believe, how then are they to make their election sure? They can no more make it sure than they can make it doubtful; as according to the hypothesis, their election is altogether independent of faith and works. How can they render an unconditional and immutable decree surer? Now, since Calvinistic election cannot be made sure, and is opposed to that which the apostle tells us to make sure, it necessarily follows that St. Peter's sense is not the Calvinistic sense.

2. "The elder to the elect Lady," "The Church elected together with you." How did the apostles John and Peter know that the individuals comprising the Church of Babylon, and the elect lady, made part of the decreed number? No sacred writer has ever pretended to have received from God a revelation indicating the persons whom God has chosen from before the foundation of the world. Upon what ground then do they stand to declare those in question elected? Evidently it can only be on their faith. It is because they believe that the apostle declares them elected. They might know their faith and not the eternal decree which concerns them, and thus they make faith the evidence of election; but they never speak of the elect where there are no believers.

3. "Who will lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" If the apostle means by the elect what we understand, he may well ask who will lay anything to the charge of believers. They are not chargeable for the past, that is expiated by the blood of their Head; nor for the present, which is uncensurable, seeing they walk unreprovably before God. But if by elect we must understand the objects of an eternal and unconditional choice, then it follows that the elect should be so designated before they believe. The Church in this case would be composed of elect believers, and of elect non-

* Judgment of the Synod of Dart.

believers, and if the apostle asks, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect," we answer, Who will not rather lay something to their charge, seeing there are unbelievers elect, who are, with all the rest of the world, lying in the arms of the Wicked One? They are certainly seriously chargeable. Who shall lay anything to their charge? God, their conscience, and all men. But the apostle says that nothing can be laid to the charge of the elect. Then it is because only those who are sanctified by the Spirit of Jesus are elected, and none are sanctified but such as believe.

4. More decisive still is this language, "An apostle according to the faith of God's elect." Unquestionably Paul did not preach the faith of unbelievers. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate that the elect have faith than this, "the faith of the elect." If there are, according to the Calvinistic system, elect, who do not as yet believe, then in preaching the faith of God's elect the apostle preached the faith of some who have no faith; but the apostle says that the elect have faith; then it is only believers who constitute the elect.

5. "Many are called but few are chosen," *i.e.*, according to the system opposed many are called, but few included in the number fixed upon from all eternity. But is this the sense of the passage? As there are few of them whose election has been decreed, why are so many of them called? Who calls them? God,—his Spirit. But why does he call them when they cannot be elected? What is the end of the call? With what name should we tax, without going beyond the bounds of moderation, that system which represents the Holy Spirit as calling, to be chosen, those whom he knows cannot be chosen? What absurdity in God to call, so as to make part of his Church, souls which his eternal decree excludes from it! What want of sincerity with respect to the many called, who ought to conclude from their call that they should be chosen, whom God induces to believe that it is his will to admit them into his Church, while at the same time there is nothing in it. Our Lord tells us that the Father gives his Holy Spirit to those who ask it of him; but the Calvinistic explanation of that text represents to us God not only as refusing those who ask him, but even as calling those whom he will refuse. Would we accuse of folly or cruelty a king who should say to his prisoners, "I call upon you to come out of the prison; but I have given orders that you be hindered." All these difficulties ruin the Calvinistic interpretation and uphold ours. If many are called, it is because many may be elected.

6. "Put on as elect of God bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind." If the Calvinistic system is Scriptural, then these words are false; for the apostle affirms that the elect are kind, humble, and merciful; but Calvinism maintains that there are

elected those who have neither kindness, humility, nor mercy. Certainly he who wrote these words had not put on mercy when he "breathed threatenings and slaughter;" and yet according to Calvinists he was already elected, whence it follows that a man may be one of God's elect and yet void of kindness, as desired by the apostle. But if the assertion of the apostle is true, it follows that those only are elected who are kind, humble and merciful, *i.e.*, believers, and that none are elected before they are so. Thus then, placed between Calvinistic and Scriptural election, we must choose the one and refuse the other, for they cannot subsist together. The first assures us that there are elect who are unbelievers, wicked and condemnable; the second, that the elect have faith and holiness, and that nothing can be laid to their charge. The Calvinistic elect, in a word, are not the same as the apostolic elect. Now, as the apostles were inspired, and as Calvinists are not, it follows that an elect one differs in nothing from a believer, and that election is the choice of all those who believe,—a choice made at the very moment of their faith, and not before.

We shall now pass on to another series of objections to Calvinistic election. There are three false views which it includes:—

I. AN ETERNAL ELECTION.

II. THE ELECTION OF A CERTAIN DETERMINATE NUMBER OF MEN.

III. UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION.

I. The words eternal election are but a contradiction of terms, inasmuch as election is separation from the world, and sanctification of the Spirit. How could the elect be separated from the world and sanctified from all eternity? Before the foundation of the world there was no world from which they could be taken. They did not exist then, so they could not be elected. These words, so often upon the lips of Calvinists, can, consequently, only signify an eternal design to elect, a design formed from all eternity to choose from the world, and to sanctify in time by the Spirit and blood of Jesus. This is a doctrine which we have no desire to combat—indeed, it is our own; but when it is added that God has thus elected a fixed number of men, which can neither be augmented nor diminished, and that their salvation is unconditional, it is necessary that we should refer these views to the word of God.

II.—1. With regard to the first, we find no text of Scripture which teaches that a determinate number of men are elected to eternal life. The passages which are habitually cited to prove it, only furnish deductions, which simply prove that there is no express declaration in favour of this opinion. But if there are none in favour of it, there are many against it; therefore it ought to undergo the test of these passages.

Election must be either election in eternity or election in time.

If it is the first, it is, as we have seen, a design to elect; if it is the second, it is separation from the world and the sanctification of their nature. It is clear that we know nothing of the eternal decree of God but by his own revelation. It is then upon this ground that the question should be placed. A design to elect is a design to save; and, when it is expressly declared in this revelation that God will have all men to be saved, that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, the system which maintains that his design was only to save some men, thereby asserts that his will is opposed to his design, which is unmeaning; else if his will is that all men may be saved, and his will agrees with his design, it follows that his will was not restricted to a determined number, but extends to all those who should believe, that they may be elected and saved.

2. The commission of the Saviour to those who preach the gospel, is to announce to every creature, "He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." Such is the eternal decree of God upon this subject. But this decree or design cannot be reconciled with the eternal design to elect a determinate number; for what good news is there for those who are not of this number? and yet it is as good news to all that the Lord wills his word to be announced. The doctrine of a fixed number destined to salvation is then a contradiction of the apostolic commission.

3. All men are commanded to believe; but if God has resolved to give faith only to a select number, all the rest are required to do something which they cannot do, and which is opposed to the will of God—which is a contradiction to all the commandments which render faith obligatory upon us.

4. Those who are not comprised in the determinate number are commanded to believe the gospel as a thing which concerns them; but as it does not concern them, seeing they are not of the number, they must believe a lie, and will be damned for not believing it, which is a contradiction to Scripture and common sense.

We leave these difficulties, and many others of the same kind which might be mentioned, for the consideration of every candid and unprejudiced mind. They suffice to demonstrate that the eternal choice of a fixed number is a doctrine which cannot be reconciled with Scripture. We proceed to the last mentioned fallacy, which is, that election or the design to elect is unconditional.

III.—1. Election being, as we have seen, a separation from the world, an introduction into the Church, and sanctification by the Spirit of God, the purpose of election will appear to be simply the purpose to elect out of the world into the bosom of the Church. Consequently, to affirm that a part of men were chosen to become

members of the Church, without foresight of faith and the obedience of faith, is to affirm that God has from all eternity decreed to establish in the world, whence the elect are chosen and the Church to which they are introduced, a distinction which has no foundation in their faith and obedience, no regard to these two qualities; in other words, to constitute his Church of persons without regard to their faith and obedience. The subjects of election in this case are chosen as men, not as believers, which is manifestly contrary to the word of God, which distinguishes between the Church and the world, characterising the one by faith and obedience and the other by unbelief and disobedience. The election of men on the condition of their faith is the principle laid down in Scripture; the election of men merely because they are of a fixed and determinate number is only a human theory. These two principles cannot agree, and one of them must be abandoned. Moreover, the history of the formation of the Christian Church proves that men were chosen into the church solely on the ground of character, of repentance, and faith. Now, if election in time has regard to faith, so also should the eternal decree, unless we are prepared to admit that for the Almighty to purpose one thing and to do another involve no contradiction.

The Calvinistic notion is, that men are elected by faith, which implies that some men are personally chosen to believe and obey, even before they have an existence. "The meaning of the words 'according to,'" says A. Barnes,* "is probably, *with reference to;* that is, he was appointed to be an apostle *with respect to the faith* of those whom God had chosen, or, *in order* that they might be led to believe the Gospel. God had chosen them to salvation, but he intended that it should be in connection with their believing; and, *in order to that,* he had appointed Paul to be an apostle, that he might go and make known to them the Gospel. It is the purpose of God to save his people, but he does not mean to save them as infidels or unbelievers. He intends that they should be believers first—and hence he sends his ministers that they may become such." Here we are plainly taught that among God's elect are to be found infidels and unbelievers, but that God has chosen them to believe the Gospel, thus removing the ancient land-mark between the Church and the world, between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not. In our opinion the apostle here teaches that God's elect are the possessors of faith, and by no means that they ever can be characterised as infidels, though subject to a purpose to bring them eventually into the possession of faith. Nowhere are we taught in Scripture that God's people are to be found as part and parcel of

* Notes on Tit. i., 1.

the infidel and unbelieving mass. Paul was informed by the Lord in a vision that he had much people in the city of Corinth. Acts xviii. 10. "This passage evidently means," says A. Barnes, "that God had a design or purpose to save many of that people." But how contrary to Scripture to suppose that that purpose existed without any regard to their conditional acceptance of salvation by faith. It is on the condition of this principle that God takes out from among us a people for his name. Acts xv. 14. It is nowhere intimated in Scripture that God elects individuals to faith, or that any can be truly regarded as of his people, prior to their faith in his Son. There are also many passages very clear upon the subject of personal election with which this theory by no means agrees. As for example, "Many are called, but few are chosen." Matt. xxii. 14. When it is affirmed that the few are chosen to faith, we ask, to what are the many called? Are the end of choosing and the end of calling one? Then we have a distinction without a difference, and the text is meaningless; but if there is a difference in these ends, and election follows the call, then the test is consistent, harmonises with the whole scheme of salvation, and teaches that the few who believe are chosen unto life out of the many who are called upon to believe, but make light of the gracious invitation, and, consequently, are condemned. Mark xvi. 16. Hence this passage contradicts the idea of an election to faith, and makes our election subsequent to the call, indicating that we are not chosen, but called to faith, and that in consequence of faith, we are chosen to salvation. Again, "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God has from the beginning chosen you unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." 2 Thess. ii. 13. These Thessalonians were chosen not from eternity but in time, for their election was through sanctification of the Spirit, and in consequence of their faith; and as their existence was only of recent date, their personal faith could not be of a more remote period; hence their election was a positive fact, an actual occurrence in time, and not a mere purpose to accomplish such an event; and the fact that this election was made dependent on their faith, proves that it was not unconditional. Election to faith is then altogether opposed to election by faith, since in the former election, election to faith, which is the Calvinistic theory, faith is the consequence of election, while in the latter, election through faith, which is the doctrine of Scripture, election is the consequence of faith.

There are many other corresponding texts which might be cited equally opposed to Calvinistic views, which we must leave unnoticed. It ought, however, to be stated, that there are certain texts quoted by theologians of this school which are sup-

posed directly to support their views, such as Eph. i. 4-6. Rom. viii. 29, 30. Acts xiii. 48. 1 Peter ii. 7, 8. Jude iv. Our space will not admit of an examination of these texts. We may, however, just observe as it regards Eph. i. 4-6, either it refers to collective or to personal election. If it refers to collective election, then election must be considered either as unconditional or as conditional; but unconditional election is excluded by the fact that the subjects of this election were believers, ver. 12, living in the possession of saving grace, ver. 6, of pardon, ver. 7., then the election can only be regarded as conditional. It was the election of those *who trusted in Christ.* And so we shall find that character is the key which easily unlocks these otherwise formidable texts; that character is the principle which regulates the Divine Sovereign in his election or rejection of men.

An unprejudiced examination of the Scriptures, we think, will lead to the conviction that the election of a fixed number, and personal unconditional election, are not taught therein. Calvinistic divines have invented the doctrine of election to faith; but this simply amounts to unconditional election, since, according to this system, the means of salvation are also predestinated.

There are certain difficulties which inevitably flow from the theories we are here opposing, which we shall endeavour to place before the reader.

The eternal and unconditional election of a certain invariable number of souls, necessarily implies the reprobation of all those who are not included in this number. According to the Calvinistic doctrine, the elect, all the elect, and none but the elect, will be saved. All those who are not thus elected are completely and absolutely placed beyond all possibility of salvation, and as all, Adam and Eve excepted, have entered this world with a nature which renders sinning inevitable, God not having elected them, which is the only means of salvation, it follows that the cause of their perdition should be placed, where all rigid Calvinists place it, in the will of God. We are aware that some who admit unconditional election reject the logical sequence—reprobation; but it is clearly a contradiction to accept the former and at the same time reject the latter. What, we may ask, must we do to be saved? Believe. What must be done to believe? Be elected. If a man has been elected he will believe; if he has not been elected he will not believe, and even if he were to believe it would be of no benefit to him, for not having been elected he cannot be saved, therefore all those who are not elected are reprobated.

Some shrewd sophists tells us that we must distinguish between the possibility of an act and its performance, that those who are not elected might be saved if they would, for they have the physical power to believe, and are only prevented from the exercise of it

by moral inability, that is to say, by their own unwillingness to do so. But this is a mere play upon words, for reprobates enter this world dead in trespasses and sins, and can only be saved by God's grace, which he has not decreed to give them; they cannot therefore enter into life eternal. They are reprobates. There is no need of a special decree of reprobation; the decree of election is the reprobation of all those who are not included in it. Calvinistic election therefore implies reprobation. Thus considered, this doctrine destroys the notions which revelation gives us of the character of God.

Calvinistic election cannot be reconciled with the scriptural declarations of God.

1st. It cannot be reconciled with the love of God. The Scriptures tell us that "God is love," that he "is good to all" his creatures. But how does it appear that he is a God of love, a God good to all, if he causes a large proportion of his creatures to be born, to live, and to die under the impossibility of their being saved? On the supposition that they had merited such a dispensation, which we will shortly examine, it could only be as the result of strict and severe justice, and not of love and goodness. When and where does it appear that these attributes of God have been exercised, first towards Pagans and then to all others not comprised in the fixed number. They have been under the stroke of Divine justice from the first moment of their existence; indeed unless it be admitted that they existed prior to their abode on earth, it is impossible to believe that ever they were the objects of Divine love. It is true that some Calvinists try to evade the force of this argument by limiting the exercise of Divine goodness to them, to the good things of this life; but the good things of this life are only good to those who are led by them to God, and to whom they are an earnest of life eternal, whilst to those whose salvation is impossible terrestrial blessings will only eventually aggravate their condemnation, for each will be judged according to the good or evil he will have done, and all these benefits will rise up as witnesses against them. What strange goodness to give fifty or sixty years of enjoyment in order to make them pay for it by an eternity of suffering greater than if they had never been so blessed! Evidently the Calvinistic and the Scriptural idea of the love of God are altogether opposed to each other. According to the Scriptures, God is good even to those who perish, seeing he offers them his grace, whilst, according to Calvinism, he cannot be good to the reprobates, for they have never received from him the means of being saved. It avails not to say that they have the natural power to believe, and consequently to be saved, if they would; for if that special grace, without which even the elect would in no case be saved, be withheld from them, it is as morally

impossible for them to be saved as it would have been physically impossible for them to believe had they been without the natural power to do so. If *special* grace is a *sine qua non* as a means of salvation, they are as much deprived of the means of being saved from whom that grace is withheld as he is without the means of crossing the river who has only a bridge that takes him half way across. As then God is good to all, he will have all men to be saved, and never could have made this decree of reprobation or of unconditional election, the inevitable accomplishment of which would conduct the greater part of his creatures to eternal death.

2. The Calvinistic doctrine cannot be reconciled with the justice of God.

And here, be it observed, we speak not of its opposition to the supposed but rather to the revealed justice of God. It is true that as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are God's ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts; but is it not manifestly absurd to suppose that, therefore, the justice of God must be in opposition to those "established notions of justice and equity which have been received among all enlightened persons?" As reasonably might we say that although two and two make four in human conception, yet as God is infinitely wiser than men, two and two in the Divine mind produce a result infinitely beyond the human product. Such reasoning could only lead to confusion and destroy all confidence in the Divine procedure. The Almighty appealed to the moral sense of the Israelites in favour of the equity of his ways, but the appeal would have been irrelevant were the justice of God and human conceptions of justice and equity essentially opposed. It is remarkable that the Divine appeal, twice repeated, "Are not my ways equal," immediately follows that inspired pleading against the Calvinists of that day, wherein God shows that the righteous shall live by his righteousness, and the wicked die by his wickedness; that is to say, that no person shall be either saved or damned in consequence of an inevitable decree. As then God therein appeals to the universal notions of equity, we only follow the rule he has laid down for us in judging his ways by those motives, which thus become competent and legitimate by his sanction. Now every rule of justice is violated by the doctrine of reprobation.

1st. Either the reprobates are destroyed solely on the ground of the sovereignty of God and without regard to their sins, or—

2nd. They are punished for the sin of Adam, to which they did not consent, or—

3rd. They are punished for their own sins, the inevitable result of a corrupted nature with which they have entered the world, and which they have had no legitimate means of changing. Let us examine each of these hypotheses.

1st. Are they destroyed solely on the ground of the sovereignty of God, and without regard to their sins? We designedly use the word destroy, because their ruin in this case excludes all idea of judgment. As it is not for their crimes they are lost, the terms penalty and judgment are irrelevant in their case. But such a course is as contrary to the justice of God as it is to his revelations on this subject. In the Scriptures the sufferings of the wicked are denominated punishments, and the acts which condemn them thereto judgment, which implies criminality and takes away all idea of destruction by absolute sovereignty.

2nd. Are they punished for the sin of Adam? They did not consent thereto; they had no will in its commission. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father."

3rd. Are they punished for their personal transgressions, the inevitable result of that corrupted nature with which they entered this world? This is tantamount to their being punished for the transgression of Adam; for abandoned to themselves and deprived of that grace which is conferred only by a decree of election, but which is refused them, their nature can only sin. Either Adam, who is the cause of that corruption, or God, who has resolved never to do anything sufficient to extricate them therefrom, should bear the responsibility of their deeds, inasmuch as they are only instruments and not agents, being placed under the law of necessity.

From the doctrine of original sin, Calvinists deduce an argument which is in opposition to the views we are establishing. Their argument is, that God may justly impute to the posterity of Adam the sin of their first parent, and that after Adam had fallen and his posterity in him, he might, both on account of Adamic transgression, and also because of all those which result from it, have condemned them all to eternal flames without giving his Son to die for them, and that consequently the doctrines of election and reprobation must be regarded as perfectly just and reasonable; for if God could justly impute the sin of Adam to all, and afterwards condemn all, then he could justly condemn some.

We by no means question the justice of God in the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. And doubtless after Adam had fallen, and his posterity *in him*, God could have justly condemned them all. But his condemnation of them would have borne a just proportion to their sin. All the posterity of Adam having *fallen in him* might have been justly condemned in him, as constituent parts of himself. So we acknowledge that in the loins of Adam we have been all what Adam himself has been, have done all what he has done, merited all what he has merited, and, that God could have justly condemned our first parents, and us in their loins, to perdition. The grand fallacy in this dilemma lies in con-

founding our seminal state with our personal state, and in affirming that what would have been just in our seminal state in Adam, would have been equally so in our personal state out of Adam. It requires but little effort to expose this fallacy.

The wages of sin is death—death eternal, or perdition. The wages of sin personally and consciously committed is damnation personally and consciously suffered. The wages of sin seminally and unconsciously committed is damnation seminally and unconsciously suffered. When Adam had personally sinned, God would have been just in inflicting upon him a personal punishment. When we had seminally sinned in Adam, God would have been just in punishing us seminally in the loins of Adam. Our punishment then would have been in just proportion to our offence; we would have been punished as we had sinned—seminally, and we should not have been more conscious of our suffering than we had been of our transgression.

But is it not contrary to all equity to punish a transgression seminally and unconsciously committed with a chastisement personally and consciously endured? For such is the doctrine of Calvinistic election, that the greater part of God's creatures will enter corrupted into a life of inevitable corruption and endless suffering, and that for a sin committed, without knowledge of responsibility, without participation of will. To say that the reprobates are punished only for their personal sins amounts to nothing, since their sins are only the fruit of a germ with which they entered this world, an indestructable germ, or, what amounts to the same thing, destructable only by means of an eternal decree from the benefits of which they are shut out. As to the assertion that God could have justly refused to give his Son to die for us, this is so palpably true that only the most ignorant and gross impiety would deny it. The gift of Jesus is not the result of necessity, or duty incumbent on our Maker, but the result of his spontaneous, sovereign love for man. But what we have to say is, that if God had not formed the plan of mercy and redemption for the human race, he would have inflicted the extreme penalty of the law upon Adam and his posterity in him, without permitting any of his descendants to have a personal existence. But because he foresaw that Christ would taste death for every man, because he made him a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, because the Lamb of God was slain from the foundation of the world, God permitted the birth and personal existence of the children of Adam. It is not the existence of Adam's posterity which compels him to give his Son; on the contrary, it is the gift of his Son which engages him to allow Adam's posterity to be born. God could have justly condemned seminally the posterity of Adam, but having predestinated Jesus to be a propitiatory victim, he calls them to a personal ex-

istence, and to a participation of the benefits of this merciful mediation. From the preceding remarks it may be seen that the argument is perfectly fallacious, and that it contains nothing which can justify the Calvinistic doctrine from the charge of destroying the justice of God.

Nor is this all; under a great variety of forms the Scriptures represent the life to come as a recompense or punishment. According to the Calvinistic hypothesis, both ideas included in these two terms are completely destroyed. The abandonment of the reprobates to the domination of a corruption of which they are not the cause, and the perseverance of the saints in irresistable grace have been immutably decreed. Men propelled by an irresistable force can be the subjects neither of punishment nor reward. Justice has no more to do with the reward of mere machines moved by an external force—God, than with the punishment of other machines moved by another external power also—Satan. The reprobates can no more be punished than stones for falling to the ground, for they can no more avoid sinning than stones resist the impulses given them. Why does that man sin? Because he cannot but sin. Why cannot he? Because the grace of God is not in him. Why is this grace not in him? Because God has resolved not to give it to him. He is then under the necessity of sinning as much as the stone is is under the necessity of falling. He can no more abstain from it than a stone can sustain itself in the air. Shall that man be punished for not doing what he could not possibly do? And why does this man become holy? Because the grace of God worketh in him. Why does it work in him? Because God has resolved to do it. He is then necessitated to become holy just as a stone projected by a sling is necessitated to rise in the air. He can no more abstain from it than the stone can resist its descending motion. And shall this man be rewarded with eternal life for having done that which he could not possibly refrain from doing? Thus the justice of God is destroyed, whether considered abstractedly or in relation to rewards and punishments so frequently expressed in Scripture.

3. Calvinistic election cannot be reconciled with the infinite power of God.

The objection which we most frequently meet with in the mouths of infidels of every class is this: Why did not God make man incapable of evil and punishment? The answer to the question is drawn from the very nature of man. God resolved to make a man and not a machine, therefore he endowed him with liberty, volition, and active powers. After having created the heavens and the earth, which necessarily obeyed the law of their Creator, unconscious of obedience and responsibility, the Deity determined to manifest a still greater power by the creation of a being in his own

image, free and responsible because of his liberty, who should not necessarily obey but who might by choice resist or obey. All this was necessary for the accomplishment of God's design. Had he been anything different, man had not been man; he would have been only a lump of animated and thinking matter, a little, but only a little, above brutes. It is because God resolved to produce a creation superior to matter and brutes, a creation which reflects the brightest beams of his glory; it is because of this that man is free. God, therefore, has not created man incapable of doing evil and of suffering, because it is his liberty and his responsibility which constitute his nature. The whole of his individuality consists in the possibility of doing good or evil, of being capable of reward or punishment. In a word, he has made him thus to manifest the most noble and admirable part of his power by the creation of him as a free agent. Such is in substance the answer given to those who ask why God has allowed to man the power of sinning. But it is impossible for the adherents of Calvinistic election legitimately to use it. On the contrary, their system, in this case, as in others, puts weapons into the hands of infidelity. In one, by the unconditional decree of election and reprobation man's individuality is destroyed; we can neither choose life nor death; both have been chosen for us from all eternity. We are no longer men, we are machines. Instead of furnishing an answer to this objection, Calvinism considerably increases its force. For since God could elect some men to salvation who would inevitably attain it, why did he not elect our first parents and their descendants to inevitable obedience and glory, since he has issued a decree which fixes the destiny of all his creatures and deprives them of their liberty? Why has he not passed a decree which would ensure the holiness and obedience of all men?

Let no one say that these are rash interrogations, and that the ways of God are not as our ways. These questions are not rash, since they issue within the limits of revelation, and find a response in the sacred volume. They are inexplicable only to Calvinism. We presume not to pry into secret things which belong unto God, but we do claim the privilege of testing any system which claims to be Divine by the things which are revealed. Deut. xxix. 29. It remains, therefore, according to the Calvinistic hypothesis, that God has not made creatures whose will is free, and that his power to create a free agent has never yet been exercised.

4. Unconditional election and reprobation cannot be reconciled with the holiness of God.

The Scriptures tell us that "his eyes are too pure to behold evil," and the Calvinistic doctrine is so far from agreeing with this declaration, and all others of a kindred character, that it necessarily

implies the absurdity that God is the author of evil. In order to condemn the reprobates with some appearance of justice, not because of his decree, but because of their deeds, which are only the consequence of it, he determines the means of their damnation, their particular wickedness and their particular sins. Moreover, he determines the duration of their life, sometimes at a great number of years, although their numerous years will only lead from sin to sin. We know that the reason why God permits the wicked to live during so many years is because he is full of patience, not willing that any should perish. Now, as the destiny of the reprobates has been eternally fixed, why does not God on the commission of the first sin take away his existence, seeing he hates iniquity? What is that attribute of God revealed or imaginable which engages the HOLY ONE to allow so many of his creatures to live in sin which he detests, and for evil to their fellows whom he loves, while that prolongation of their days is useless? The Scriptures we know teach us the holiness of God, and we are satisfied they do not teach us inevitable sin, which is the consequence of unconditional election.

5. The doctrine of reprobation is irreconcilable with the equity of God. So far as we are aware, all Calvinists believe in the salvation of our first parents; but how contrary to equity to have mercy upon them for a crime personally committed and from which proceeds all the sins of the world, while millions of their unfortunate descendants born in a state of sin, which is not the consequence of their personal choice or sin, will be visited with indignation and wrath.

6. The doctrine of unconditional election cannot be reconciled with the immutability of God.

When Adam proceeded from the hands of his Creator he was declared very good, being the image of him who unites in himself every possible perfection. God pronounced these words in time while the decree of election was fixed before time. Now, before the fall of Adam, all his posterity were like him, holy in him, and God must have considered them as such before he considered them as fallen and sinful. It thence follows that there was a period in which God did not love holiness and innocence, since he hated Esau and reprobated him, although very good as part of the first man who was very good. Let us now place ourselves in the garden of Eden, before the fall. All the reprobated posterity of Adam, which are holy and in the image of God in his loins, are nevertheless already reprobated. God has already devoted to eternal flames innocent creatures made after his likeness. But subsequently he declares that he loves good and hates evil; and certainly that is not an immutable God who casts millions of guiltless creatures into the lake which burns with fire and brimstone and afterwards

by his Son said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." In like manner the second part of the doctrine, the eternal salvation of the elect, cannot be reconciled with the immutability of God; for if on the one hand an absolute hatred existed against the reprobates, even in their state of holiness and righteousness, on the other hand, an eternal absolute love existed towards the elect, even in their fallen state in Adam. And here again the God that could love the fallen race and their sins is not the immutable God who hateth the workers of iniquity. In the case of election, as in that of reprobation, the immutability of God is found to be a complete chimera. It cannot be said in reply that hatred to the reprobates and love to the elect are founded upon the foresight of unbelief and faith, since according to the theory we oppose, election is made without foresight of faith, and faith and unbelief are really not the causes but rather the effects of this love and hatred. It is furthermore futile to say that God loves the one on account of his Son, because they are united to him, and that he hates the other because they are out of Christ. It is true that subsequently that becomes the cause of a new affection; but as to be or not to be in Christ is the effect of an absolute decree, it is also true they must be previously loved or hated in order to their being elected in Christ or reprobated out of Christ. Then again, the gift of Christ is the effect, not the cause of love. John iii. 16. And thus, independently of their faith, independently of Christ, independently of all, the one were hated although holy in Adam, and the other loved although sinful in Adam. Hence it inevitably follows that God is far from being immutable in his love of holiness and hatred of sin.

Thus limiting ourselves to these Divine perfections, the love, the justice, the power, the holiness, the equity, and the immutability of God, as they are taught in the Scriptures, are destroyed by the human theories which we have examined.

J. M.

ART. II.—THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD'S MERCY.

AN EXPOSITION.

"What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor for him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will *have mercy*, and whom he will he hardeneth."—Romans ix. 14-18.

WE begin our illustration of this section by reiterating our belief, expressed in a former paper, that personal election to salvation and the collateral doctrine of personal reprobation are not taught in this chapter. What it drives at throughout is, not election, but salvation by grace as opposed to acceptance by the merit of obedience.

The section commences with two interrogations: "What shall we say then?" and "Is there unrighteousness with God?" followed by a solemn denial to the second one—"God forbid." "What shall we say then?" is Paul's usual question when he has reached a point in his argument and wishes to gather up what has been advanced. By this challenging question he quickens the attention of his readers, and carries them forward to another stage. "Is there unrighteousness with God?" If he prefers Isaac to Ishmael, and Jacob to Esau in a matter of church privilege, in which neither of them had claim, and reverses the rule of civil rights, is he unrighteous? If he makes his own grace and mercy the rule of acceptance for guilty men, is he unrighteous? Is he not a sovereign? May he not determine the conditions on which he will accept and adopt fallen men into his favour? And may he not discard and proscribe the merit of works without trenching upon equity? If it can be proved that he has done so, and acted on the principle of pure grace, the equity appears in the fact. His doing of a thing is evidence of its rectitude. It must be received as an axiom in theological science that what God does is right. A perfect Being as he is, the standard of goodness and rectitude, and out of the reach of evil motive, he is incapable of wrong. When therefore he has done, or decreed to do, a certain thing the equity of such deed or decree must be accepted and allowed to be correct, even though it should startle and alarm our minds. The Standard must not be questioned. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth

do right?" Some have said as much about fallible, mortal men, occupying god-like offices. It has been taught that "kings cannot err," and "the king can do no wrong." The world has had large evidence to the contrary. But it is true enough of the King of kings. "He is my rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him." Psalm xcii. 15. The supposition of injustice in the Divine procedure the apostle meets with a weighty negative, which our translation Englishes by, "God forbid," which, though no translation, well expresses the emphasis the original bears. The same thing is usual in other like instances. The simple import is, "*let it not be*," let such a thought be received with aversion or abhorrence.

Verse 15. "For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. This is the style of Sovereignty—I will. It is as if the Lord had said, "The terms on which I will receive men to favour, shall be of my own dictation. I will not receive all to favour indiscriminately. And I will receive none who challenge my favour as a right and in the spirit of demand. The moving cause shall be my own kindness and not the desert of the creature."

A celebrated writer of the Arminian school of theology paraphrases this clause, "I will have mercy on whom '*or what kind of persons*' I will have mercy." If we understand the relative pronoun, "whom," to mean a description of character rather than certain individual persons, all is easy. And how can we take it to mean *persons* irrespective of *character?* It is incredible that the Divine Being should fix upon certain persons to make them objects of mercy whether they should be penitent and believing or hard and contumacious. "God accepteth no man's person." He receives no one to favour on personal grounds, because he is accounted something in public esteem, or because he is in high office, or has a sharp intellect, or is of a personable figure, or has an imposing countenance. Nor is any one received on the ground of pedigree, because he is derived from a notable ancestor. Such considerations act upon men and influence their regards to certain individuals. But it is on all hands agreed that it is discreditable to be moved by the said things. And we must not ascribe to the very standard and mirror of rectitude what we hold to be unworthy in a good human character. His ways are above our ways. He receives none to his favour because they are significant or insignificant, rich or poor, noble or ignoble. He looks on men with an impartial eye. What motive could he have to set his heart upon one more than upon another? He is too great and too good to be partial. Partiality is the offspring of weakness, or want of character, or capricious humour, for which no just reason can be given. The Infinite Majesty is above all this. He is too exalted to flatter

men, or to have need of them or dread of them. He is too *good* to be partial. The love that breaks forth towards some in given circumstances and states of mind, will infallibly reach others in the same condition. And the justice that overtakes some of a given character will be measured out to all of the same class. We dare not charge the Almighty with arbitrary or capricious humour. He is pure rectitude and reason, and with these his entire administration harmonises. He does not act upon private fancy in the exercise of his mercy, but upon a public rule which he has resolved on and made known, treating men as free and responsible still, though they be fallen. The rule of mercy is very largely set forth in other parts of Scripture, it being frequently declared to what sort of person it shall be exercised, namely, to those who repent and believe. None need be in doubt of acceptance who submit to the terms. On the other hand, none who neglect the conditions specified can entertain a reasonable hope of favour. The Lord has resolved to save those who repent and believe. He has not determined to save certain persons, whether they repent and believe or not, nor to condemn to misery others who do repent and believe. We are aware that the theologians of a certain school would admit this, and still maintain the harsh doctrine they draw out of this chapter by saying that the Lord resolves concerning certain persons that they *shall repent and believe*, and takes sufficient measures to bring about this result; whereas certain others he leaves short of these effective means and measures, whence results a moral certainty that they never will repent, the act of preterition rendering it impossible. This is the point requiring proof. We submit that it cannot be proved from this chapter. And if we turn away from this to the general scope of Scripture, which we have a right to do, that we may balance Scripture with Scripture, we find a strong current running counter to such a doctrine. In all the plainer parts of the sacred writings, the Lord urges men to repentance and faith, and offers them pardon and salvation. We are bound to believe him sincere in doing this, the more especially as we find him expressing the strongest desire that men would relent, and grieving over their obduracy and rebellion. This would be shocking inconsistency, if there was a fixed purpose to withhold from them the grace necessary to produce the required state of mind.

It is sufficient then, if from this sovereign-like utterance we deduce the doctrine that the Lord reserves to himself the privilege of dictating terms and saving *what kind of persons* he sees proper. The terms, though only intimated in this verse, are more largely expressed elsewhere. In saving men he has come athwart all our preconceptions, and resolved on such a dispensation of his favour as mocks all human rules. He pours contempt on merit,

and pardons on a free principle, for his own sake, the least sinner having no claim on mercy and the greatest not being out of its reach. The doubling of expressions in this 15th verse is worthy of remark: "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." To repeat the same thing in words of synonymous import, or even to use precisely the same words over again immediately, gives emphasis, intensity, or force. It shows the person making the utterance to be very resolved and earnest about it, as if he could hardly help saying it. This sovereign right of deciding the conditions of his free mercy, the Lord evidently regarded as one of the brightest jewels in his crown, which none could meddle with, or pick at, or attempt to pluck from him without being chargeable with high treason.

To the same purpose is the—

16th verse, "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." From first to last, salvation is the result of mercy. There is a supply of two words in this verse, namely, "*it is;*" quite a natural and necessary supply, as the words read abruptly without it. Adopting this addition to the original text, there still remains a question what the supplied pronoun refers to. "*It* is not of him that willeth." We ask, *what* is not of him that willeth? Some reply, *election*. We prefer to say *justification*, or acceptance with God, which is the subject in dispute. It is the writer's object to establish the doctrine that justification is not by works or worthiness, but purely by Divine grace. "It is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth." The Jews were great willers, and workers, and runners. In ceremonies and ordinances they were pragmatic and active to a degree of superfluity. They hoped by their diligence and exactness to earn the crown, and render God their debtor to such a degree that he must as a matter of right place it on their heads and proclaim them worthy to wear it. To upset this mistaken conceit is the scope of this whole epistle, as well as this ninth chapter. The writer proscribes and disallows the very principle of their industry. By an agony of argument he labours to establish grace in opposition to their mercenary principle of work and wages. He affirms that their excessive diligence drove them further from the work, instead of bringing them nearer to it. They ran a race in which they were not lawfully started, and in a course of their own choice. They were wrong in running at all for such a prize. Divine favour is not a prize to be run for and awarded to the speedy. It is a pure gift bestowed on the poor, and miserable, and wretched, who lie down at the door of mercy to die, or live if God pleases. It is not the labour of the hand that makes rich, nor the fleet foot that comes first to the goal, nor the penetrating in-

tellect that best apprehends the saving truth. What is given by favour cannot be got by skill or claimed by desert. The generous Donor will not have the blessing wrested from him by clamorous candidates who sweat and toil for it. "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth." There is thought to be an allusion in these expressions to two persons, Isaac, whose *will* it was to give the blessing to Esau, and Esau, who *ran* to hunt venison to prepare his father's mind for pronouncing the benediction. Or "him that willeth" may have respect to Abraham's earnest *wish* for Ishmael to be promoted to covenant honours, at the very time when a promise was being made to him of another seed, "Oh that Ishmael might live before thee." Gen. xvii. 18. The Lord took his own course. The will of man is inadmissible in matters of grace. Self-devised action becomes labour in vain. How unavailing was Esau's running While he was out on the common with bow and arrows shooting game the blessing he was expecting as the elder son was being disposed of to his younger brother. Too late to interrupt the ceremony or to intercept the blessing, he arrived with a back-load of game. Though he ran both ways he was not quick enough. Not the priority of his birth, nor his steady aim in archery, nor his successful morning's hunt, nor his father's partiality and preference, nor all united together, could cancel a bestowment of the blessing in another direction. Let all legal hunters after justification be admonished. It comes not by natural right, or skill, or merit. Those who receive it are utterly ineligible. The likeliest way, and the only way indeed, to come at the inheritance of grace is to give up every claim, and place yourself "at the posts" of mercy's door in sackcloth, with an empty, open hand, and an expression of misery in your face. Mercy soon sees such an object. It takes little notice of well-dressed, full-fed, happy-looking people. A poor bankrupt tradesman, quite broken and done for, is likelier to attract attention. "He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away." Luke i. 53.

Having vindicated the principle on which grace is bestowed, the writer proceeds to defend his other point.

Verse 17. "For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." The "for" at the beginning of this verse looks as far back as to verse 14th, and shows that it is a reply to the question there, "Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid." Let the 14th and 17th be read in close succession, the intermediate verses being omitted, and the writer's aim is perceived. Thus, "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?

God forbid. . . . . For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh," &c.

"The *Scripture* saith unto Pharaoh." Here is a trifle of rhetoric, the Scripture being said to speak and to do things which it neither utters nor performs, but simply records as having been done or said by some one. We add two examples. Gal. iii. 8: "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal. iii. 22: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." The silent record, though void of active agency, is said to do what he did who caused it to be written. This in passing,—

"Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up that I might show my power in thee," &c. In the absence of qualifying considerations this sounds harsh and heavy. It startles and alarms us for the honour of free-agency, which it seems to ride over roughshod, to say nothing of the Divine equity, which we name with reverence as apparently dishonoured. At the first blush of these words Pharaoh stands up before us as fore-doomed, anterior to birth or being, or actual misbehaviour on his part. But the first thought is liable to correction. Fair interpretation comes to our aid, takes off the sharp edges of the passage, and rounds and smooths it into harmony with the love of God and the free-will power of man. It is necessary to ascertain what is the import of the expression, "have I raised thee up." On this clause, and the strife there has been about it amongst commentators of different schools of theology, we might describe a glorious battle-field with an array of noble names on either side, and some might be found on the one side of the field whose theological sentiments would have determined them to the other, candour prevailing over their creed, which is to be set to their credit. We have no wish, however, to raise such a dust of controversy. We would rather thread our way quietly by the clue of Scripture to a conclusion. There are several senses in which the expression in question may be taken with some show of plausibility. It may mean, "For this purpose have I *created* thee, or caused thee to be born." "God is able of these stones *to raise up* children unto Abraham." Matt. iii. 9. "And their children *whom he raised up* in their stead, them Joshua circumcised." Joshua v. 7. It might mean, "For this purpose have I raised thee *to royal power*." "Moreover, the Lord shall *raise him up* a king over Israel who shall cut off the house of Jeroboam that day." 1 Kings xiv 14. "Who *raised up* the righteous man from the east, called him to his foot, gave the nations before him," &c. Isa. xli. 2. In favour of this explanation it may be said that it has been usual for the Lord to exalt particu-

lar persons into prominence and power for great public purposes. See Esther iv. 14., Gen. xlv. 4-8., Isa. xlv. 1-5., Jer. xxviii. 6, 7., Dan. v. 18-21., Isa. x. 5, 6. It will pay the reader to turn up these passages. Again, the phrase in hand might mean, "For this purpose have I *excited* thee." So we say we *raise* a man if we vex and chafe him and stir up his evil passions. "When I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim *and raised up* thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man." Zech. ix. 13. This explanation is as offensive as any that could well be given to the place. And yet this is preferred by a modern commentator of considerable note,* who renders it, "For this purpose have I *roused* thee up." But we have yet to learn that any of the foregoing senses can be supported by the Hebrew verb used in Exodus ix. 16, the chief and ideal import of which is found in the margin of that place, "*made thee stand.*" We decidedly prefer a sense distinct from those previously given, which is, "For this purpose have I raised thee up *from affliction*, or preserved thee from dying in the plague." In several successive plagues numbers of his subjects had died. The judgments were so mortal that he names them by the name of death—"Intreat the Lord your God that he may take away from me this *death* only." Exod. x. 17. Although his people had been diminished he was yet spared and survived, and was admonished to take advantage of this forbearance. This explanation is the mildest we can adopt. We are happy to find it patronised by a number of distinguished scholars, amongst whom is the celebrated Hebraist, John Parkhurst, and it is said, John Calvin himself. This sense of the phrase, which we cordially accept, falls in with a common feature in the ordinary arrangements of Providence. The conduct of this notable public person, softening under a judgment, and becoming hard and haughty on its withdrawment, is repeated in common life to this day by persons of no figure or significance. Under a stroke of affliction they soften and promise better behaviour, and upon recovery fall into their own courses, furnishing presumptive evidence that if suitable circumstances were supplied they could be a match for Pharaoh. When God exercises men with successive afflictions, and renews their lives after they have been reduced and imperilled to the near point of death, what explanation is his sparing of them subject to? It is commonly and correctly interpreted as kindly forbearance: "The long suffering of our Lord is salvation." Was there any such intention in relation to Pharaoh? Was it possible for him to repent and be spared the fearful doom he fell into? Would God let him repent? We answer, yes, to all these questions, although the text expresses no such thing, and even indi-

* Moses Stuart.

cates a purpose apparently against it. "That I might show forth my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." If we consider the declaration by itself, apart from the history, and from other declarations and acknowledged and understood rules of the Divine administration, we must conclude that the Lord meant him no kindness, and had no mercy in store for him. The difficulty vanishes as soon as you joint it with the accompanying history, and allow it the benefit of being qualified by known and established rules in the Divine government. The absence of an express offer of mercy to the stubborn king is no evidence against its exercise in the event of his repentance. It is quite an understood rule that when a threatening is uttered in absolute terms, without a word about mercy, an alteration in the spirit and behaviour of the person or persons threatened will affect the case and stay the course of justice, unless also it were expressly added that repentance notwithstanding, the evil would come. The sparing of Nineveh on the submission of its penitent people is a bright example of this rule. Its doom was pronounced in terms quite positive and absolute; no encouragement expressed that reformation, tears, or prayers might reverse the calamity: "Forty days and Ninevah shall be destroyed." The known character of the Almighty enabled the people to add a clause to the brief and terrible utterance. They heard more than Jonah said. "Forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed,"—*unless its people repent.* This last was whispered in their heathen hearts. What hinders us to apply this rule to Pharaoh? Say that the purpose expressed in this 17th verse in words so stout and stern, may be read with some additional clause, written with invisible ink which would have started into clear view on Pharaoh's penitence, and you obviate the whole difficulty. With the warrant of rule and fact before our eyes in the Scripture, we need not hesitate to explain with this freedom. There remains, indeed, a difficulty from its being said that the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart. This also is capable of mollifying explanation to candid and patient inquirers, that take pains to ascertain the usage of Scripture and the licence it takes, liable to discant and qualification, by itself acknowledged. Let it be remembered that nothing is more common than for a thing to be ascribed to God which is done by men, by his permission or furnishing occasion for. Take the single example of Joseph's captivity in Egypt. All the blame and burden rested on his malicious brethren. Yet he affirms that God sent him thither. How so? Was all the enmity rankling in the hearts of his brothers gendered in them by positive Divine agency? Certainly not. Providence supplied them opportunity, by causing such a conjunction of things, that a company of merchants should heave in sight when they were on the point of leaving him to perish. The wicked-

ness of selling him was theirs, and his going to Egypt is still set to a higher account. In like manner the Lord furnished occasion for the hardening of the Egyptian monarch, but still he hardened himself. So we find this hardening set now to the Lord's account and then to Pharaoh's. And as it is often said on this subject the king hardened himself first before the Lord hardened him, (Exod. viii. 15) although candour must acknowledge that his hardening was prospectively calculated on earlier. Exod. iv. 21, and vii. 3. Our conclusion, therefore, is that he was hardened by God in no other way than was consistent with moral freedom, and with the possibility of relenting and submission, in which view we are still further confirmed by the fact that he was on different occasions next door to the submission required, and all but yielded. Large acquaintance with the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writings takes off the revolt otherwise felt at its hard expressions.

The purpose contemplated by the Divine forbearance was, in point of fact, realized. Divine power was shown in the overthrow of the haughty monarch, that is to say, punitive power was manifested, for it is evidently justice that is meant rather than physical might. "Who knoweth the *power of thine anger?* even according to thy fear so is thy wrath." Ps. xc. 11. That power was signally displayed when Pharaoh himself (as we presume) and the flower of his army disappeared beneath the waves of the Red Sea. The second purpose has been, and is still, answered, "and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth," that is, through all the *land* of Egypt, some explain. We may safely give it extension beyond the confines of that land, and take it in a world-wide sense, embracing all nations and all times. To the end of the world Pharaoh will stand as a monument of justice, and distant ages will read the story of his overthrow to the praise and glory of God.

Verse 18. "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." This is a conclusion affecting the double exercise of sovereignty first in pardoning a given description of persons, and secondly in hardening another kind. Pharaoh was the type of all whom God would harden. Those who act as he acted, abusing the Divine patience, repenting and sinning as he did, may expect to fall under the Divine displeasure. "He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy." Prov. xxix. 1. It is clear, then, whom God will harden. The example cited was of one who resisted all gracious overtures, a wicked, tyrannical king, who encouraged and strengthened himself in sin. Those who follow the same course, though they reach not to his high standing and stature, will perish after the same example.

He shows his mercy to whom he will, that is, to all penitent

sinners. And this he *will* do. No one can put him off it. He is mightily resolved that he will do it, and speaks of it in the language of a sovereign decree that is sealed and certain. When Pilate had written over the cross, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," and some wished him to correct and alter it, the high reply was, "What I have written, I have written." It was the style of majesty. The terms on which a sinner is received to mercy are fixed. No interference in heaven or earth can alter them. The great King will pardon none but upon his own published terms. And he will not deny pardon to one who comes within those terms. So he will abandon to their deserved doom such as overpass the limits within which his mercy is exercised. In this none shall persuade him to alter. As he will do the one so he will do the other. Thus the strongest motives are furnished for men to seek his favour as a free gift, and to shun his wrath as a deserved penalty. So we are deterred from trifling with sin by the dread of justice, and by the offer of free mercy encouraged to be penitent and obedient. He doubles motivity to us by terrible things in righteousness, and by the tenderness of his infinite love. Let us stand in awe and sin not.

T. G.

ART. III.—JOSEPH STURGE.

Memoirs of Joseph Sturge. By HENRY RICHARD. London: S. Partridge, Paternoster Row, 1864.

THE reading of this interesting volume is most refreshing and invigorating. To know Mr. Sturge is to think better of our race, and to be inspired with noblest purposes and aspirations. The biographer has done his work well. It was evidently a great labour the family imposed upon him in this work, inasmuch as his duties were manifold and engrossing; yet it was a labour of love to him. He knew his friend intimately, and revered him profoundly. He has not, however, allowed his strong friendship to warp his judgment; but writes with sobriety and clearness. It is to be expected that he vindicates the name and memory of his subject in connection with those great movements in which he played so prominent a part. But in doing this he shows himself defective in the highest biographic faculty, for a true biography

should be an exposition and not a defence. What marks of haste and confusedness in statement appear we will not dwell upon, but thank him for bringing us to know this good, and in the best sense, this great man. We heartily commend him for his determination to compress his materials into one volume. With such a subject, had he been a mere book maker, he might have easily produced three volumes; but his memorial would have been a tomb to bury the name of his friend in. We also commend the warmth and life breathing through these pages. It is not a mere dry chronicle, but a fresh, vivid, refined delineation of the man. He crowns his friend with high praise; and did we not believe that the facts justify it, we should turn from the book disgusted. But for more than thirty years Joseph Sturge was before the public working with heroic soul in those political and philanthropic movements which make this century a century of wonder in human progress. He had so much to do in originating, or guiding, or working these movements, and so great a portion of his life was absorbed in them, that their history is his history, and conversely his history is their history.

Events of a most exciting and convulsive character occurred about the time of his birth, August, 1793. Europe was disquiet and torn by political upheavings. Dynasties were overthrown, political constitutions of ancient standing were torn to shreds, and revolution with threatening aspect brooded over many parts of Europe. The Empress Catherine had just destroyed the constitution of Poland; Sweden was in agitation, and its king had been assassinated; India was blazing with lurid fires of war; France was in the throes of revolution; the National Convention had decreed the downfall of royalty in Europe, and proclaimed, "that the rights of man was a devouring fire to consume all the thrones of Europe." The very year of Mr. Sturge's birth the weak, yet amiable, king of France, after enduring nefarious cruelties and insults, was dragged to the guillotine and beheaded, while the frenzied crowd yelled, shouted, and danced in infernal merriment. In their madness they believed it was their mission to republicanise Europe; and soon the Netherlands, the Rhine Provinces, and Toulose, were the theatres of bloody slaughter. Our own country was torn by factions, and our army was engaged in doing bloody work on many fields and our navy on many seas. In this time of commotion, war, and revolution, our apostle of peace and philanthropy was born, and in grappling with these giant evils he spent his life.

His birth-place was in a quiet, rural district, one of the most beautiful in England. For variety, richness, and extent, the landscapes about the mouth of the Severn are not to be surpassed in this country. In the most beautiful part of this district, a

scene of almost paradisaical loveliness and fertility, the villages of Tockington, Olveston, and Elberton, are situated. In this last village Joseph Sturge was born. For many generations the Sturges had been settled in the neighbourhood; they were substantial farmers and yeomen, and had been "Friends" from the existence of the society. An ancestor of his, a Joseph Sturge, was one of the first converts George Fox had in that part, when he evangelised the county of Gloucester. His maternal ancestors had been warriors, one of them a soldier of fame in the revolutionary war, and commanded the troops at the execution of Charles I. Another, a Stephen Marshall, was the first of the "five Smectymni" who stoutly opposed Bishop Hall in the Prelacy and Liturgy controversy. Joseph was the sixth in succession who bore the name in the family. It cannot be questioned that this line of Quaker ancestry on both sides had much to do in the formation of this youth's character. The manifold sufferings of these people for conscience sake, their quiet but indomitable resistance to tyrany, their philanthropy, and their simple, earnest piety, all told upon this young Quaker. His parents had means that might be spoken of as ample, and his home was the scene of plenty, cheerfulness, and content. He was a healthy and vigorous child, and grew to be robust and capable of great bodily exertion.

When young he was removed to his grandfather Marshall's, near Evesham. Here his body got the benefit of unlimited liberty to roam about at his own will, nut gathering and bird-nesting. In this latter sport he was daring and expert. He often returned home with his dress torn, much to the annoyance of the prosaic-minded housekeeper. Soon becoming convinced of the cruelty of his favourite pastime, he at once relinquished it. He was exceedingly fond of riding, and though not expert he was a fearless and venturesome horseman. Here then is this youth, of singularly active and enterprising temperament, exuberant of animal spirits, and of fearless nature, climbing giddy heights, rushing through stream, hedge, or underwood in pursuit of game,—training his body for the great strain it would be put to in after life. When an old man he took his children over the scene of these early exploits; and when in the village it flashed into his mind, when he saw the village inn, that he and a servant boy had defrauded the landlady by passing a counterfeit sixpence upon her. Though sixty years had gone by, his conscience smote him, and finding out, after much trouble, a poor granddaughter of the woman, he gave her five pounds.

Joseph's grandfather broke up his establishment, and so he had to return to Elberton, and commence schooling. This was when he was ten years of age. Having lived a life of unbounded freedom, he seems to have felt the confinement and routine of school

irksome. He was shortly afterwards removed to a Friend's school in Somersetshire. The master seems to have thought it his chief business to attend to the spiritual condition of his pupils—so, intellectually, Joseph made little advancement here. After three years residence he was taken home, with nothing but the bare rudiments of an English education. This was all the professional schooling he got. But in these years the leading features of his character, which have made his life worth writing, began to show themselves. He never mixed with school contentions; but when he saw the weak oppressed, he resolutely defended and helped them, and generally the petty tyrant quailed before him. About the time of his leaving school, when he was fourteen years of age, he became seriously awakened with respect to his spiritual condition, and thenceforth set himself to serve God with his whole heart. He records with evident pain the partiality of his parents for the other members of his family and the slight put upon himself. He revered his parents, which made him feel this the more acutely. At his father's desire he commenced business as a farmer. Though not liking this profession, he entered heartily into it when it was decided upon. He had frequently to go into Bristol, and thus became acquainted with a number of young Friends, who formed an "Improvement Association." The essays and debates of this society exercised a very stimulating effect upon the young man's mind. It was a time of intellectual quickening to him. His own papers read and debated were very creditable performances. He shortly became the energetic secretary of the Thornbury branch of the Bible Society. If his connection with the debating class in Bristol quickened his intellect, the visit of some Quaker missionaries to his neighbourhood quickened his spiritual sensibilities. He accompanied these good men on a preaching tour, and provided places for them to preach in, &c. He was at this time drawn to serve in the militia. It was impossible for him to bear arms either personally or by proxy, so he had to suffer for conscience-sake, for the authorities came and drove off nearly all his sheep; it was nearly his all, yet he made no resistance.

Not liking his profession, he gladly embraced the offer of the Cotterells to join them in the corn trade. He resided with his partner for a short time at Bewdley, in Worcestershire; then he set up an establishment of his own in a beautiful spot on the banks of the Severn,—his sister Sophia joined him as housekeeper and companion, a position she sustained for nearly thirty years. His father died in 1817, when he cheerfully undertook the care of the family; and when in two years his mother also died he took the younger members of the family to his own home, and by his true delicacy and affection made them feel it to be their own true home. He never assumed airs of authority,

and yet they all felt his was the ruling and guiding power. His partnership with Mr. Cotterell only lasted about three years, when he commenced business on his own account; he soon took his brother Charles into partnership, and a happy union this proved to be. He knew that if he was to succeed he must devote himself to the business with unremitting assiduity. The trade in corn at that time to a young firm was singularly hazardous and speculative. So great were the fluctuations that large fortunes were quickly made and as quickly lost. In these uncertain currents and violent and treacherous squalls the most steady and skillful pilotage was required from our young traders, to avoid disaster and shipwreck. They were often staggered and near the verge of ruin, yet Joseph steered through all and kept himself calm, doing his duty and trusting in his God. His industry was unflagging and his efforts herculean, yet in all he never omitted his religious duties or the claims of benevolent institutions. Many have grown rich, but in the growing rich they have become harsh, purse-proud, and sordid, and have become insensible to the higher forms of intellectual and spiritual life; but this young merchant kept the liberalising and generous spirit of Christianity operating within him. It was in this active period of his life that he commenced to labour in philanthropic movements.

In 1822 he removed his residence to Birmingham, the metropolis of the Midland counties. He built a house in Edgbaston, where he resided all his life. In all his commercial transactions he showed the gentleman and the Christian. In seasons of difficulty and embarrassment he never resorted to any expedients or tricks, which involve a deflection from the line of strict integrity, and which, while they may succeed commercially, leave scars upon the conscience. His conscientiousness was seen when the Temperance movement began to awaken public attention in this country. Mr. Sturge identified himself heartily with it, and in order to "keep his soul clean" he and his brother gave up the malting department of their trade, and the vaults under their premises were no longer let for the wine and spirit business. They realized considerable sums of money from these sources, but they cheerfully gave them up. They felt it right to go so far as to cut off a lucrative branch of trade in barley for malt. Many instances we might give of their noble spirit in trade, but we must deny ourselves.

As an employer Mr. Sturge's conduct was most exemplary. Though he resided thirty miles from Gloucester, where the business was conducted, he frequently went to cultivate an intimacy with his workpeople; he did not treat them as serfs or mere tools to produce wealth for him. He visited them at their homes, freely conversed with their wives and children, and rendered them any assistance he could. This was not done in an offensive and patron-

ising way, but as their true friend. He met them annually at tea, and spent the evening with them, and encouraged them to lay their grievances before him. No wonder that the rumour of a strike was never heard among them, for reason and right feeling guided master and servants in relation to each other. A Gloucester newspaper, opposed to him on all political and ecclesiastical questions, affirmed that these brothers must be the veritable Brothers Cheruble, immortalised in "Nicholas Nickleby." He was generous to the poor and struggling, while he was exact and strict in all business transactions. But this volume treats more of Mr. Sturge as a "Christian, Philanthropist, and Citizen" than merchant. Soon after his residence in Birmingham, he was elected one of the commissioners of the town; it was not then a corporate town. But he soon got into collision with many of the townspeople, because he opposed the town hall being used for the performance of Handel's "Messiah." He had a repugnance to a crowd sitting

> "Content to hear
> Messiah's eulogy for Handel's sake."

He shrank from the most awful solemnities of religion being declamed and sung by persons of disreputable character. He exposed himself to much odium by this course, but it never moved him an iota from his convictions. His first political essay was in earnestly aiding the election of an anti-slavery and free-trade candidate for the city of Bristol. Of course he had no personal liking for the excitement of contested elections, but he held that social obligations and Christian truth require us to wisely exercise our political rights. The years 1830-1-2 and 3 were memorable ones in the political history of this country; the judgment and sympathies of Mr. Sturge were in the popular direction. He was to his dying day a thorough reformer. He took a somewhat prominent part in the "Political Union" of Birmingham. By his sound practical sense, his urbanity, and his inflexible adherence to suasive and reasonable methods of action, he helped in no small measure to restrain the fiery vehemence and violence of the more extreme party of reformers. He was the more earnest in the cause of Parliamentary reform, because he was convinced that only a reformed Parliament would touch the question of slavery in the West Indies. No serious steps had been taken in the legislature to remove that blot from our national escutcheon. It is true that in 1807 the slave trade had been abolished, but still the incubus crushed and cursed our beautiful islands of the West. It is also true that the evils of the institution were sometimes brought before the Parliament by such men as Wilberforce, Brougham, Lushington, Sir J. Mackintosh, Denman, O'Connell, and above all, by Sir T. F. Buxton. Tidings frequently came of the enormities openly practised

by the planters. Still no hope appeared of emancipation. the nation soon became awake upon the matter; one thing tending to this was the bitter and relentless persecution of the missionaries, whose main purpose was to educate and Christianise the slaves. The leading philanthropists of the country determined to raise the standard of immediate and total abolition. In this none were more active than Joseph Sturge. In the struggle about to ensue he went to the front and remained there till the cause of humanity triumphed. He first tried to infuse new life into the Anti-Slavery Society. Many of the cautious friends of this organization looked coolly and suspiciously upon the bold design of this young Quaker. Even Sir Fowell Buxton thought him rash and precipitate, though afterwards he frankly and handsomely acknowledged that his course was the right one. To say that his whole soul was in this humane enterprise is only to speak in sober verity. He travelled through the British Islands to evoke, organize, and direct, the opinion of the public. He worked and travelled literally night and day,—to meet committees, address meetings, call upon persons likely to help, to encourage the flagging and dispirited, to diffuse information as to the real condition of the slave, to reply to the mis-statements of pro-slavers, &c. His zeal, energy, and ability, carried everything before him. Attempts had been made at compromise; but Sturge's battle cry was—"No compromise, total and immediate abolition;" hence he strongly objected to the apprenticeship system, and to the payment of millions for the redemption of the slaves. It was not on fiscal grounds merely he objected to the price, but on moral. The planters, however, got their money, and the seven years apprenticeship was adopted. The great party who had really fought the anti-slavery battle felt that a grave mistake had been committed by their parliamentary leaders. They saw that their work was only half done, and another struggle inevitable. The negro, under this new system, could not leave the plantation at his will, nor dance with his children, nor hold intercourse with his neighbours. The whip, the treadmill, the chain-gang, and other tortures were resorted to. An emancipation allowing this was only a mockery. One great difficulty in upsetting this new system was the obtaining of reliable information. This being a serious obstacle, Mr. Sturge resolved to go, with Mr. Harvey, of Leeds, and fully investigate the state of the case. We cannot follow them on this difficult mission; but their work was thoroughly done. Mr. Sturge was more fully convinced that the payment of the twenty millions was a deliberate fraud, and that the compromise with these traffickers in human flesh had been an utter failure. After much trouble they got the matter mooted in parliament; they failed several times, but ultimately, on the 23rd of February, 1838, it was determined that, on the first of

August of that year, the last prop of the vile system should be torn down. The opposition from the Whig government and interested parties was most determined, but they won by a majority of four. While Sir G. Strickland, Sir E. Wilmot, O'Connell, and Joseph Pease were the parliamentary workers, the great movers were Joseph Sturge, George Thompson, J. Conder, and John Scobble. It was a glorious work to liberate 800,000 men from oppression and bondage!

To the end of his days Mr. Sturge was deeply concerned for the welfare of the coloured people in the West Indies; and his interest was not in mere sentiment, but in countless deeds. His name was a household word in those islands, and spoken with blessing by hundreds of thousands of lips. Even while we write this page we learn that his widow has devoted the money collected by some friends for a memorial to him to chapel furniture among the blacks in the West Indies. After the emancipation of British slaves he turned his eyes to the United States, where slavery existed in colossal and blackest forms. To help the few abolitionists in America was now one of his greatest desires. He suggested that the friends of freedom should meet from all parts of the world to confer as to the best means to secure their common object. This was carried into effect, and a most remarkable gathering took place of nearly six hundred good men and true. There were the veterans Baxter, O'Connell, Lushington, and Villiers. The great out-door orators of the anti-slavery cause were there, G. Thompson, J. Burnett, J. Scobble, and S. Bowley. The world of letters was well represented by Sir J. Bowering and others. The apostolic Knibb was there, while the States of America were nobly represented by Lloyd, Garrison, and Wendell Phillips. The nations of the Continent were not behind. The venerable Clarkson, his body bent with the weight of eighty years, the patriarch of anti-slavery agitations, fitly presided.

In 1841 Mr. Sturge saw that he could materially help on the good work in the United States by a personal visit. We cannot dwell upon the perilous voyage, the many and difficult journies, and the personal inconvenience and suffering he endured in this tour. He obtained an interview with the President, his ministers, the governors of several States, Dr. Channing, and other leading men in the North. He visited the slave marts of Baltimore, and mingled with the negroes. He was in Washington, working among the Congress men, when the infamous "Gag Law" was proposed, which, had it passed, would have prevented petitioning the legislature against slavery. That his influence was felt is seen by the reference to him in that "rowdy journal," the *New York Herald:* "Joseph Sturge is now in Washington, using every means in his power to procure the abolition of slavery in the District of Colum-

bia. It was principally through his sinister influence that the decision of the House of Representatives, the other day, resulted in favour of the abolitionists; and what he may effect before he gets through with his schemes there it is impossible to say. Let the Southern Delegates in Congress look to this Sturge." From a survey of the work he accomplished in this tour it is clear he did not a little to give a vigorous impetus to that mighty movement that has overthrown slavery in the States of America.

Soon after his return he was brought into unpleasant collision with many people by his efforts to stop Sunday traffic on the London and Birmingham railway. As a director he tried first to move the directorate; failing this, he made two efforts with the shareholders, polling a large number of votes in each instance; but the tide was against him, and so he threw up his directorship. He did not take this step because he believed in the perpetual obligation of the Jewish Sabbath, or in the sanctity of any day, for on these points his views coincided with his co-religionists; but because he believed some time should be exclusively devoted to religious purposes. This was in 1838. When Birmingham was incorporated he was elected one of its aldermen, without any solicitation on his part. He found when he came to qualify for his seat in the council, that there was an objectionable declaration to be made, that he would do nothing to disturb the relations of the Episcopal Church to the State. He could not make this declaration, and resolved to assume the functions of his office and abide by the consequences. In the Chartist agitation, Birmingham was one of its headquarters. While Joseph Sturge held many of its political doctrines, he repudiated and opposed the violent and revolutionary spirit of its leaders. But the town became the scene of great excitement, owing to the meddling of the Government with the right of public meeting, and a large number of London police were sent down, which made matters worse, for these cockney constables got into conflict with the populace, and the safety of the town was in danger. In the midst of the disturbance Mr. Sturge was seen going among the excited multitudes, and cooling them and reasoning with them, and with good effect. He got a Civic Committee appointed, and sat as its chairman, and thoroughly investigated the cause of the riot. It is hard to say how much the citizens of Birmingham were indebted to him in this matter.

He laboured as ardently in the Corn Law agitation as in any cause he espoused. He made a deep impression upon the leading ministers of State in an interview with them as one of a large deputation, by an exhaustive speech upon the impolicy of the odious restrictions on corn. Some of the friends of this movement were for compromise, but our Quaker did not like compromises with evil, and he sternly refused to be any party to such a step.

He demanded the total and immediate repeal of the tax upon the people's bread. The China wars roused his opposition; he was indignant that the resources of a Christian Empire should be used to deal death and destruction into the heart of a heathen Empire to support the execrable opium trade. We think, however, he did not give the political and international questions involved sufficient weight.

In 1841 he was induced to contest the borough of Nottingham against Mr. Walter of the "Times." Had he allowed the usual flow of money he would have won the seat; but not a shilling would he permit to be spent, save for legal expenses. His opponent was prodigal in his use of money, and of course won the election, and was afterwards unseated for bribery. As it was Mr. Sturge polled 1801 votes. He was led to try his fortunes in another parliamentary campaign in 1844, in his own town of Birmingham, but he found the frailty of electoral virtue was not proof against temptation there, and so lost the day. In all these scenes of party and political warfare his conduct was eminently gentlemanly and christian, so that his enemies expressed their admiration of the man, and several freethinking politicians were led through his conduct to embrace Christian truth, among these is one of the most eloquent and able ministers in the Midland Counties. When Sir J. Graham wanted the country to accept his education vagaries, Mr. Sturge was one of the first and firmest in his opposition to the minister's proposals, which were fraught with folly and mischief. He also joined Mr. Baines in opposing Lord John Russell's State Educational Scheme. He was thus brought into contact with the leaders of liberal sentiments in Leeds; they, approving of his views, brought him out as their candidate in the election of 1847. Here the wealth and local influence of his opponents defeated him, though 2,000 votes were recorded for him. He was several times after invited to stand for certain boroughs, but he firmly declined and became convinced that the sphere of his operations was out of Parliament.

In 1845 his household was invaded by death; his sister Sophia was taken from him. She had been his constant companion for a long course of years. She not only presided with grace and dignity in his family, but her vigorous and well-stored mind was of essential service to him in his many and extensive schemes of benevolence. Her sisterly tenderness and never failing affection was one of the great comforts of his life; so that when she was stricken down and taken from him he bowed his head in grief and sadness. After eighteen months he married Miss Dickenson, of Coalbrook Dale.

When the Evangelical Alliance was formed several pro-slavery ministers from America joined it, but he publicly denounced them, *and the Alliance* was purged. He even bearded the Wesleyan

ference when a certain pro-slavery doctor in divinity was sitting
them. So decided was he on this matter of slavery that he
d consume nothing produced by slave labour. He strove hard,
expended large sums of money, to create a free-labour market
a free-labour demand. This was attended with so much suc-
hat before the civil war one-tenth of the cotton of the States
ree-labour cotton. When Mrs. Beecher Stowe was feted in this
ry she found quiet in the Edgbaston home; and she says that
isit was like the communion of Christian and Faithful in the
table mountains.

the Oregon controversy he feared that the patriotic bunkum
mp orators, newspaper writers, and interested parties, would
us into a war with the United States; and he got up meet-
nd brought public sentiment to bear upon Sir Robert Peel;
e rejoiced when Lord Ashburton settled the difficulty. When
evolution of 1848 hurled Louis Philippe from the French
e, and the Republic was established, our philanthropist saw
ening for urging upon the new government the necessity of
hing capital punishment and slavery in the French posses-

So he sought the aid of a few friends, and they went to
and got interviews with the ministers in council. Lamartine
a the chair, to whom he addressed an elaborate and powerful
nent on these important subjects with such effect that an
was given to prepare a bill for carrying out Mr. Sturge's
stions.

instance of his fearlessness where conscience dictated was seen
s standing forward to resist the foolish alarm of this country
e silly yet harmless "papal invasion" of 1850. An immense
blage was brought together in the Birmingham Town Hall to
nate against the inocuous fulminations from the "Flaminan
" This fearless Quaker stood forward to move an amendment
e denunciatory resolution submitted to the meeting. The
dment demanded equal religious liberty for all classes of the
n's subjects; the notables of the town and district were there,
he debate lasted all the day; but there stood Sturge calmly
the storm, contending for what he believed to be the rights
science. He was pained to have to withstand such a man as
Angel James, but no personal admiration or friendship ever
d him from what he saw to be his duty. The remainder of
ys were spent in spreading peace principles and in private
ies. The spirit and teaching of the New Testament seemed
n so diametrically opposed to the violence and malignity of
hat the more he read of it the more his soul was permeated and
sed by the power of the gospel of peace, and his convictions
evils and crimes of war in Syria, Spain, China, Affghanistan,
e, Punjaub, New Zealand, and South Africa, occasioned him

much distress. He made strenuous efforts to get the principle of arbitration recognized instead of the blind, brutal, and bloody arbitration of the sword. That eminent statesman, Richard Cobden, undertook the difficult duty of bringing the subject before Parliament. We have his masterly and unanswerable speech now lying before us,* and we have no hesitation in saying that for closeness of reasoning, clearness of statement, and comprehensiveness of view, it is one of the greatest addresses we ever read. In Sturge's peace labours he found noble yokefellows in Messrs. Elihu Burritt and H. Richard, and with their aid got up Conventions in Brussels, Paris, Frankfort, London, Manchester, and Edinburgh. They sought in these conferences to induce the governments of Europe to form arbitration treaties, to reduce their armaments, to adopt uniform standards of weights and measures, and coinage. The wise men of the world laughed at them as visionaries, and at their principles as utopian. The fault of these men was that they were before their age; but as society advances and becomes ultimately reconstructed, these principles will rule the world. But crying down a thing because the world had not come up to it was the last thing to move our godly corn dealer. He worked the harder. Not that he was fussy or dictatorial, but he was ever on the alert, going anywhere, speaking or getting others to speak, bearing cheerfully the lion's share of the labour and the cost. He seemed ever fresh and vigorous, full of practical expedients, and always animated by his Master's spirit. From the Frankfort Convention he was induced to go in company with Messrs. Burritt and Wheeler to try to get the dispute between Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein submitted to arbitration. They did not offer themselves as arbitrators, but endeavoured to secure the consent of the contending parties to select competent persons to decide the points at issue. And they would have succeeded but for the meddling of professional diplomatists.

Before long Europe was to be the scene of a war of gigantic magnitude; Russia was ruled by a Czar who inherited all the ambition and ecclesiastical prejudices of his greatest predecessors, tyrannical, rash, violent, and reserved, not asking or allowing counsel on many critical questions. He would often take the executive into his own hands. He was a rabid Greek Church-man, and strove to increase the prestige and power of his Church. France was ruled by a Bonaparte, just crowned Emperor of the French, who, to find work for his soldiers, and to divert the minds of the people from his own acts, and thus to consolidate his power, drifted us into war with Russia. The questions of the keys of the Holy

* "Speeches of Richard Cobden on Peace, Financial and Colonial Reform," page 97.

Sepulchre and the silver shrines at Bethlehem were only used to blind Europe and the world. When Mr. Sturge saw whither we were drifting, he anxiously asked, "Can anything be done?" He suggested a deputation to the Emperor Nicholas. He did not want to go himself, but when it was put upon him he was not the man to refuse. So, with Messrs. H. Pease and R. Charlton for colleagues, he set off in the winter to St. Petersburgh, to represent to his majesty the unspeakable importance of preserving the peace of Europe. They had an audience with him on February 18th, 1854. Mr. Sturge was the spokesman, and he addressed the mighty autocrat in such earnest and pointed terms and with such a solemn manner that the Czar's eyes moistened, and he was obliged to turn away. He held a long conference with them and then introduced them to the Empress and the royal family. As soon as they had fulfilled their mission they turned their steps homeward. The present writer well remembers how these men were assailed and abused in this country. The "Times" led the way. At first it spoke of their mission in terms of generous admiration, but like itself, turned round and bitterly taunted and blackened them most coarsely. Numerous other papers echoed the terms of the oracle of Printing House Square. Mr. Kinglake, in his history of the Crimean war, a work of singular ability, sneers at these Quaker missionaries, and affirms that in his future volumes he will prove that the kindly feeling manifested to the deputation was turned into a frenzy of anger against the French and the English people. But unless he has better evidence to adduce than we have in these volumes, strict justice will compel us to record the plea of "Not proven." We might say something about the unwisdom of holding these threats out for so many years. This much has been ascertained from travellers, that over the Russian empire, from Finland to the Ural mountains, and from Archangel to Odessa, the story of their extraordinary mission was the subject of eulogistic remark by the Russian people. The war broke out and raged furiously. It could hardly have been otherwise with such an ambitious man as the Emperor Nicholas for an enemy, with such a subtle and crafty man as Napoleon for an ally, and such an infuriated people as we then were. In the calm of subsequent years, the Quaker mission to Russia has been the theme of universal commendation. During the war Mr. Sturge stood by the side of Richard Cobden and John Bright in trying to stay the war mania. It is singular to read in the very "Times" which in 1854 hounded on the country to war, in 1861 speaking of that war in these terms:—"That ill-starred war, those half million of British, French, and Russian men left in the Crimea, those two hundred millions of money wasted in the worst of all ways, have discharged to the last iota all

the debt of Christian Europe to Turkey. Never was so great an effort made for so worthless an object."

At the close of the war, Sturge and his friends sought interviews with the Plenipotentiaries of the great powers in Europe, to get a clause inserted in the treaty of Paris recognising the wisdom of resorting to arbitration. The distress among the Finnish people through the wanton and ruthless destruction of private property secured his sympathy and help. This destruction was not done by the admirals, but by petty officers, who were rash and reckless, and so they burnt and plundered wholesale and indiscriminately. The sufferings of these poor people touched Sturge's heart. He set about helping and relieving them, and with his old colleague, Mr. Harvey, and at great cost and sacrifice, went among these people, inquired into their sufferings, and distributed the munificent sum of £9,000. No wonder that when, three years after, the tidings of Mr. Sturge's death reached the shores of the Baltic, the Finnish fishermen and peasants wept and mourned as for a father. With his views and opinions, we know with what horror he read of the Indian mutiny. He wished that a deputation could go to India to inquire if the natives had any real grievances, and would have gone himself but it was shown him that the country was so unsettled he could not thoroughly carry out his purpose.

Nearly his last public act was to oppose Sir James Brooke's filibustering in Borneo.

He was gratified with the election of Mr. Bright for Birmingham. For the Birmingham people he cherished an increasing regard. We have seen how he laboured in their political interests, but he also laboured in their moral and social interests. He was one of the first to secure open spaces for recreation. He also established a Hydropathic hospital for the poor, and engaged the most noted practitioner of the day. He was also the prime mover in the establishing of baths and washhouses. He frequently had Bands of Hope to his house and grounds. Working Men's Institutes found in him a generous supporter. He was the means of getting up an adult Sunday-school, with a view to catch the unwashed wanderers on the Sunday. He for a considerable time laboured himself in this school. No class of the suffering portion of the commnuity seemed to escape his loving care and sympathy. The subject of juvenile crime occupied his mind very much. He determined to make an effort to rescue these young criminals. For this purpose he took a large house and fitted it up, and secured the best master he could; then he went to the goal and police authorities and sought from them sixteen of the most notorious boys they could select; for he was resolved to give the thing a thorough trial. He zealously co-operated with the master, and the result proved

most gratifying, for in all the sixteen he collected there was not a failure. Encouraged by this success, he purchased an estate in Worcestershire, and fitted the building up for a reformatory. Here he collected sixty boys. The interest their benefactor took in these unfortunates was deep and absorbing. He spent nearly all his spare time among them, he appealed frequently to each boy and entreated them with words of warning and love. While he subdued them by love the severest discipline was maintained. An overture was made to him to turn the reformatory over to the county authorities, but he declined, believing he could work it better himself. It was found that eighty per cent. of these boys were saved. This delighted his very soul, and made the enormous outlay a pleasant burden to bear. His private charities were numerous, for he loved "to do good by stealth." On the death of Mr. Hindley he was chosen President of the Peace Society. This he deemed one of the greatest honours of his life. In this cause he laboured to the last. In the spring of 1859 he went to London, to preside at the annual meeting of the Voluntary School Association, and munificently contributed to its funds. He was also engaged to preside at the Peace Society's meeting in Exeter Hall, May 17th, 1859. On the evening of the 13th of May, he was drawn to spend some time in earnest conversation and prayer with one of his children. On the morning of the 14th he rose at six, his usual time, and as he was wont, spent an hour with his Bible and his God, then he called one of his little girls to join him in his customary ride on horseback before breakfast; but being seized with a distressing fit of coughing, he sat down, and said to his wife, "I am very ill." The servants were called and such remedies as they had were used, but with no success. On the window being opened he knelt before it and prayed with intense earnestness, but in a few and broken words. His sufferings increased, he became unable to walk or stand, and being lifted upon his bed he shortly after died. The slight contortions from his terrible sufferings left his countenance; just as he died a smile of heavenly serenity beamed from the face of death. The news spread through Birmingham with electric swiftness, and from mouth to mouth it ran—"Joseph Sturge is dead!" In that vast town he had not a single enemy. All parties and classes joined in lamenting their common loss. The Corporation awarded him a public funeral, but this was declined. Speaking of his interment, his dear friend, Rev. J. A. James, says, "The lengthened corteage, the closed shops, the crowded streets, the long procession of respectable men, the mixture of ministers and members of all religious denominations, the seriousness and sorrow that sat on every face, seemed to say, 'We have lost a benefactor.' The numerous sermons from the pulpits of various bodies in tribute to his memory, all proclaimed

the respect in which he was held." Several impressive addresses were delivered at his grave by persons of his own persuasion. It was determined at a town meeting to perpetuate his memory by a statue and drinking fountain, which was opened in 1862.

We might have dwelt upon many interesting facts in Sturge's life, and on the features of his character, but we must refuse ourselves that pleasant duty, only noticing as we conclude the following things:—

I. He was able to do as much work as he did by reason of his vigorous constitution of body and mind. His stature was somewhat below the middle height, but he was squarely and strongly built, capable of great exertion and endurance. His brow was broad rather than high, his eyebrows were dark and bushy, but his benignant grey eye wonderfully softened their austerity. There was nothing moody, morbid, or capricious, about him. He had a free, vigorous nature—always agreeable, cheerful as the day—always firm of purpose—always reliable, he might be counted upon like a law of nature. His gentle, generous, and benevolent qualities tamed down the natural sternness of his nature. He was always a prime favourite with young people, a proof that he was not sullen or morose. He was fertile in devising means of enjoyment; though he was the straitest of his strait sect, yet he believed in people being happy, and desired to see a happy world. Thus, while his character was remarkable for its strength and fibre, and on questions of principle he could no more be moved than the Alps, yet no man was more amenable to reason.

II. His devotion to the cause of liberty and philanthropy was absolute and all-absorbing. He profoundly believed that it would be for the benefit of this country if every man held the elective franchise. This was a leading article in his political creed. He was no visionary or demagogue, but a cool, practical thinker; this conviction he retained all through life. Of his labours in the fields of benevolence and philanthropy we have spoken, yet we have not told a tithe of what he did. There have been large numbers of men more elegant, more learned, and more wealthy, (though he might have gained enormous wealth had he not for years given away half of his income,) but few, if any, whose faith in God, in humanity, in truth, and justice, have been equal to his. He believed, and therefore acted. Things which men branded as being impracticable, he made them by his energy practicable. He troubled little what the world said about him. One who knew him well says, that "he was more regardless of the opinion of the world than any man he ever knew." He, as we think, was unwisely extreme in this.

III. The foundation of his noble character was his deep, earnest piety. He feared God with his whole soul. His was no

profession of philanthropy, no Pharisaic parade; all that sort of thing he literally loathed. He lived

"As under the great Taskmaster's eye."

Devotion was a habit, not a fitful thing, but an abiding disposition. When he had foreign and illustrious guests he still kept up his family worship. The last words he read were the beautiful verses in Hebrews vi. 17th to the end. Many have obtained titles, and have done little to deserve them; Mr. Sturge got no human titles, indeed he disliked them, but he, in due time, ascended to hear his Master's "Well done" pronounced upon him. As we read the story of his life we fervently desire that many more such labourers may be thrust into God's vineyard. And in conclusion we accord to his name the noble titles applied to him by his friend John Angel James, in a crowded meeting in Birmingham:—"Joseph Sturge was a *Christian*, a *patriot*, and a *philanthropist*."

E. H.

Art. IV.—RELIGIOUS INSTABILITY.

RELIGIOUS instability is the bane of Christian churches, and the grief of many a godly minister of Jesus Christ. While it excites the profound regret of the faithful, it also calls forth the contempt and scorn of the ungodly. In many respects it operates against the interests of the church of Christ. It weakens the hands, and discourages the hearts of feeble believers, and, it is to be feared, keeps many from uniting with the church, and taking upon themselves the profession of the christian faith, who are inwardly moved upon by the Spirit of God to take a step in that direction. It is easy to see that injurious influences must be produced by the conduct of unstable souls who are ever professing to learn, but who actually never come to a knowledge of the truth. They discredit and scandalize that glorious system of truth and love, by which God designs to enlighten, purify, and bless the world.

We profess to believe and teach that the religion of Christ is the true happiness of man; that the bond with which it unites all men together in true and lasting brotherhood is the bond of love; that the morality it inculcates is pure as the source whence it

proceeds; and that the peace which flows into the heart from its belief and practise is unspeakable, that the hopes it kindles in the soul in relation to the felicities of a future state infinitely transcend in truth and sublimity the dreams of a godless philosophy. And then, when it is demanded of us, where are the men who exhibit this glorious morality in their conduct, and who drink of these sweet and satisfying joys flowing from the fountain of Christ's religion?—where are these men? we point of course to our Christian churches, and say, "Here are the models of what we conceive men should be." But are all our members such Christians? Would to God all were! Men of the world adverse to Christianity are sufficiently quicksighted to see at a glance, that, although there are many in the different churches who can stand the test of such an examination, and whose career all along has been like that of the "shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day," there is another class, and a class, alas, too numerous, that belie our description of what religion is, and who, by their unstable and erratic conduct, cover their brethren with grief and shame.

Now the mischief of such instability is, that cavillers have ground to say, Their religion cannot be what they represent it, if it were the best and happiest life that any man can lead on earth, as they affirm, would so many of their brethren turn back? They would have gone on had they found anything in it to induce them to persevere. It is quite clear that they still prefer what they, in religious cant call the flesh pots of Egypt. They still prefer the pleasures of the world to the joys of devotion; a satisfactory evidence that religion is really not what they expected.

It is very trying to hear the like of this; and that observations of this description are made in relation to our churches, we cannot deny. We find these exhibitions of a defective piety in all our circuits, and have often to deplore our inability to prevent them. We propose in the following observations to enquire into the *causes* and *cure* of religious instability.

CAUSES. Religion itself, looking at its design, enjoyment, and ultimate destinies, is of such transcendent importance, that we should think no man embracing it from an enlightened conviction of its excellence would ever waver in his attachment to its principles, or grow careless about the performance of its duties. And he would not, providing his perception of its excellence were sufficiently clear, and his convictions of its value in regard to himself sufficiently deep. But this does not always happen.

As to *conversion*, whether it is *sound* or otherwise, is an important starting point in this inquiry. A sound conversion will lay the groundwork of stability, and we incline to think, that when a man's conversion is sound at the first, there will be much less trouble with him, as to the matter in question, in after life. There

can of course be only one sort of conversion in the Bible sense of that term; and a scriptural conversion is to be made a "new creature in Christ Jesus;" to be "renewed in the spirit of our minds;" to be "born again;" "born from above;" "raised to sit with Christ in heavenly places;" "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son;" brought out of "darkness into marvellous light;" out of "bondage into glorious liberty." Now let any man examine these expressions or figures of speech, and he cannot fail to see what a glorious blessing is a true conversion, and how unlikely it is that a man will lightly throw away such an inestimable good. We therefore judge that religious instability rises in great part out of the absence of true conversion. We cannot pretend to judge at the time when a sinner professes to be brought to God, whether it is a mere profession, a delusion, or a sound and real work of grace. Time must reveal this. God alone can read the heart, and he alone understands and traces that mysterious operation of the Holy Ghost, by which the human spirit experiences a "death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." But the great law of Christian charity compels us to take the most favourable view of every case of professed conversion, and to receive with joy and gratitude the testimony of all anxious souls that God has accepted them. Some conversions are attended with such encouraging and affirmatory circumstances that we feel confidence in them; we are persuaded they are the right thing; but there are others where certain scriptural evidences are either entirely wanting, or but feebly and imperfectly developed, so that we can only hope for the best. Now it often turns out that no very marked change takes place in the habits, conduct, and general conduct of some individuals who profess to receive spiritual good. They join the church and continue a religious profession for a while, and then gradually fall away; perhaps from profession, perhaps from the public ordinances of religion, perhaps from both. There are degrees in the strength of a good man's faith, for so the Bible declares; we read of "weak faith," "little faith," and "strong faith;" so there may also be degrees of spiritual benefit communicated when men profess to receive salvation; when the amount of benefit is small, then the danger of instability is correspondingly great. Another cause is,—

Absence of thorough earnestness in seeking entire devotedness to God. It is a serious mistake to suppose that when the pardon of sin is obtained, the sole object of the Christian life is answered, and that there is nothing beyond to create alarm as to the possibility of losing what we have gained, or to elicit desire for further manifestations of God's saving power. The true state of the case is this, that conversion, when even perfectly sound, is only the commencement of a religious course. It is, with all its excellence and value, only the dim dawn, the twilight of the coming spiritual

day. It is but the birth of the spiritual man; all the growth that develops symmetry of form, or that imparts vigour and strength, or that adorns with manly grace and beauty, is yet to come. The new convert is but a babe in Christ, and in the Scriptures it is urged by every form of argument, in numerous instances by metaphor and by the most encouraging promises, that advancement in the divine life is imperative, that the babe must grow into a young man, and the young man into a father; that after the blade there must be the ear, and then the full corn in the ear; that the grain of mustard seed must grow; that the leaven must work until the entire mass is permeated with the process; and we have positive command added to figure and metaphor that we are to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Nothing in doctrinal truth can well be clearer than that God expects his children to advance in the divine life, and that he commands it.

Now we say that in relation to the subject under consideration, this command is not generally attended to by Christian people. Higher manifestations of spiritual life are neither expected nor sought after with the intensity and ardour their value and importance demand, and the result is a dwarfed and stunted religion, so feeble and insufficient that it fails to carry a man over the smallest difficulties, religious or otherwise, that happen to come in his way. He who refuses to exercise his spiritual faculties, and neglects the facilities put within his power of obtaining more grace, may expect, according to the Bible, to lose the grace he already has. God removes a man's candlestick out of its place when he refuses to walk in the light it throws around him, and let every careless professor remember that gifts and graces abused, are sooner or later resumed by their original owner.

Lack of mental culture. God designs men to cultivate and improve the mental faculties with which he has endowed them. Religion is a reasonable thing, and is designed to bring the reasoning faculties into exercise. It certainly does appeal to the emotional part of man's nature, but not exclusively. How often are we called upon to examine the grand and glorious verities of our common faith. We are commanded to "search the Scriptures," to "judge as wise men," to "stir up the gift that is in us," to give attention to reading." Thus it is our religion appeals to our judgment and understanding; it courts inquiry and examination, and that man has but a poor and imperfect idea of the genius, the spirit and design of Christianity, who supposes it has no higher purpose to serve in its mission of mercy to him than to make him *feel.* If the unstable soul will read his Bible, he will find there are other duties imposed upon him over and above the duty of getting himself made happy. The New Testament will give him a parable about the talents, how God

dealt with the servants who employed their talents properly, and how he dealt with him who did not employ his talent at all. And every professor of Christ's religion who does nothing for God, nothing for the church, nothing to save souls; who does not even improve his own mind and heart, has good reason to tremble lest the doom of the slothful servant should eventually become his own. How can we expect any man to become an intelligent, stable, and useful Christian who never takes a book into his hand; never reads the Scriptures; never takes any means to improve his mind? The man who never examines the foundation of his faith, can hardly know on what kind of basis he is rearing his superstructure. The man who never inquires into his own religious belief, can hardly give a satisfactory answer to any man who asketh a reason of the hope that is in him. If every church member imitated him, when would the world be converted to God? And when God shall sit in judgment on men's souls, and give to every man according as his work shall be, what will be the reward of him who hardly knows there is a Bible, or who is scarcely aware that God hath endowed him with the power to think?

True it is, that many poor members of Christ's church have but few books, and little leisure to read those they have; but there are other cases where it is different. But in all cases, if men would redeem the time from idleness, from unnecessary sleep, from needless visits, and frivolous conversation, ample time would be found to answer all the demands of religion, towards cultivating a character marked by intelligence, stability, and usefulness.

It is especially desirable that members of the church should be acquainted with the Scriptures. When they can be persuaded to adopt anything like a regular, uniform, and systematic perusal of the book of God, there is food supplied for profitable thought.

It is one of the excellencies of the true man of God, that "his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night." If a man's position and necessities preclude the cultivation of general literature, he should seek to excel in divine wisdom, specially in the knowledge of that book which is able to make him "wise unto salvation."

Neglect of the means of grace. The infinitely wise Being who made us what we are, and who redeemed us by a plan of his own devising, must have the most perfect knowledge of our requirements, and must best know how to promote our advancement in moral excellence, or likeness to himself. The means best adapted to promote and consolidate our growth in piety, he has instituted. These are chiefly the preaching of the gospel, and meetings for social and public prayer.

Now if religion was nothing more than a deep conviction of the good, and true, and beautiful in the science of ethics; nothing

more than simply an operation of the intellect; the perpetual recurrence of devotional meetings would be unnecessary. But the religion of Christ is a very different thing from either mental science or mathematics. The facts of these sciences once learned, are learned for good. We are in no need of having it continually dinned into our ear that three times three are nine, or that the square of four is sixteen. These operations performed twenty times give no man a deeper conviction of their truth and accuracy. Moral and spiritual truths, truths relating to God, the soul, and eternity, occupy a very different sphere in the realms of thought, and serve for higher and nobler purposes. It is found by experience that contact with the engrossing affairs of this life has a tendency to abate the force of religious truths, and to wear off the impression of eternal things; therefore to feel these truths in all their requisite force, we require to have the impression of them continually renewed. The example of Christ must be ever held before our eyes to keep alive the desire of imitation; the blessings of salvation must be frequently exhibited to draw out holy desires after them, and the duty of prayer must be frequently performed to keep alive the spirit of devotion, so essential to a steady and active piety.

This is just what the means of grace are designed to do, to keep alive a feeling superior to earthly anxieties and cares, and to draw away the affections of the heart from those objects that either pollute, or alienate it from God. In the very establishment of them God declares the means of grace to be necessary to the spirituality of our minds, and to the stability of our piety. The man who neglects these must endanger his own piety, inasmuch as he deprives himself of the very thing that God designs to impart life and power to his heart. The week-night congregations, as a general rule are very small, especially in our large towns. The fact is a melancholy indication of the absence of deep religious earnestness among the bulk of our church members. In some instances no doubt, good reasons may be assigned for the absence of many, but in other cases the great hindrance is the want of religious fervour. No man can make satisfactory advancement in the divine life who dispenses with the use of the ordinary means of grace, except on the Sabbath day.

Omission of secret prayer. This alone is sufficient to account for the instability of by far the greater number of those who do not go on to perfection. No man can maintain his religious life, and exhibit a stable and consistent piety without attention to his closet. Prayer is the breath of the soul's life. The thought that the religion of Christ can exist in the heart in the absence of communion with God, cannot for a moment be entertained. This can no more be, than the body can exist without the air of heaven, or destitute of its natural food. Secret prayer then, being essential to spiritual

life, can we be surprised at the instability of a man, when we know that he seldom, perhaps never prays in secret? If the history of unstable souls were known, in reference to this particular thing, we should never expect that they could be "stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." But supposing we could know the religious history of the mass of church members, it is to be feared we should feel great surprise, and something still more, sad, at the exceedingly small amount of time and earnestness spent in secret devotion. The strength of the soul is recruited mainly from this quarter; here daily supplies of grace are to be sought; and here the safeguards of a truly pious life are to be derived and strengthened. You cannot imagine a man coming fresh from the throne of the heavenly grace in secret, with the spiritual dew of Hermon on his soul, and going direct into sin either secret or open. Such a supposition shocks all our ideas of likelihood, and is quite at variance with our experience of Divine things. Secret prayer braces up the soul for the battle of life; gives, so to speak, tone and strength to the inner man, so that instead of standing shivering and shrinking at the sight of spiritual toil and danger, it goes bravely on. "I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me." Unstable souls are not much alone with God. The spiritual is too little their element. They prefer company more in harmony with their low religious condition. They have not the strong secret drawings after God and Divine things which the truly faithful feel. But it is not simply their misfortune that they are destitute of these feelings—these drawings after intercourse with God—it is their fault—their sin.

CURE. All the experienced Superintendents of the Primitive Methodist Connexion know what a large amount of wear and tear there is in our larger Circuits. When our new Roll Books are introduced in June to supersede the March list of members, we see at a glance the serious amount of change that has taken place in the muster roll. In small Circuits our members disappear by tens, in larger Circuits by twenties, and in the largest Circuits by hundreds. This seems very startling, and there may in some localities be less change in the general membership; but in the main it is substantially as we have put it. It may in truth be said that a very large amount of this disappearance of members is unavoidable, and arises from the operation of causes that we cannot control, such as removals, emigration, death, &c. These causes are always at work reducing the number of our members, and always will be at work, and we are prepared to submit to inevitable processes; but a careful examination of the roll will soon convince us that our losses arising out of the changes of time and death are small indeed compared with our loss from another quarter. For instance, in a Circuit comprising from 600 to

1,000 members, from 16 to 20 will ordinarily die, but scores and even hundreds will fall off from meeting in class. This is the grievance, the plague spot, the sore evil under the sun. What are we to do here? We believe if the experience meetings were abolished it would make a difference with many. If attendance at the Sacrament, for instance, was the only test of Church membership, many would remain with us as a Church who separate from us. When the current of religious feeling runs low, people do not like class meetings. We wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not recommend the discontinuance of our class meetings—very far indeed are we from such a wish; but from extensive experience we state the fact, that we lose many members who decline in spiritual life, who would still remain with us, but they are not willing any longer to meet in class; and in consequence of this, Methodist law says, they cease to be members.

We have stated a few of the causes of religious instability, at least a few of the causes which in our judgment lead to spiritual decay, and consequent instability; let us now suggest a few means to aid in curing it.

Superior Leadership. Religion is often compared in the Bible to certain forms of vegetation. Now we know that although the processes of vegetable growth are not entirely under our control, and are even quite beyond our comprehension, still the skill and experience of the gardener or husbandman often produce important results, both as to the acceleration of the growth and the improvement of the species. Ye are "God's husbandry," says the book, trees of his right-hand planting, a noble vine, wholly a right seed. Now, that which good husbandry or gardening does in nature, good leadership does in the church. The leadership, at least in our forms of it, is peculiar to Methodism, and arises out of the impossibility of our ministers taking the complete oversight of our societies. If our preachers had but one society requiring their pastoral oversight we should not in that case require leaders in the same sense as we now require them. But it is a common case among us for the superintending minister of a circuit to be unable to see some of the societies for weeks, and sometimes even for months together. The sphere of his labours covers a large extent of territory, and while absent from parts of his flock and engaged in performing distant duties some one must take the oversight of these societies, to administer reproof, warning, instruction, or correction, as the case may be. Now it is perfectly clear that work of this description ought to be committed to intelligent and skillful hands; and it is equally evident that the improvement, enlargement, and consolidation of a society depend very much on the piety, prudence, sagacity, and intelligence of such a deputy. Hence the necessity of good leaders, seeing so much depends on their

management. We all know the extreme difficulty of finding such men in sufficient numbers to meet the ever-recurring wants of the connexion; and how often have we to deplore the sad necessity of laying hands suddenly on men.

The mind of a leader ought to be richly stored with theological sentiment. His position and duties require this. He speaks to the same people week after week and month after month on the important matters of religion and salvation. It is desirable that his instructions should be to the point, changing their tone and sentiment with the ever-varying emotions of religious experience. He should lead his flock into the green meadows of God's word, and beside the still waters of divine consolation. When "cast down" he should cheer them with the promises of God; he should warn them of the dangers that beset the Christian path; he should encourage them to aim at a higher religious life, and help them into it by his own example—and thus "employ each art, reprove each dull delay, allure to brighter worlds, and lead the way."

Have all our classes such a leader at their head? We are free to confess that, in our judgment, this is one of the weak parts of the connexion, and it is weakness in a vital part. The quality of the instruction imparted in our classes is neither so rich, varied, nor nutritive, as it ought to be. And yet we get the best men the connexion affords to fill this office. If our leaders are not learned, nor skilled in the word of God, in most cases the disability is a matter of necessity. The advantage has been denied to the station they occupy in the social scale. Ignorance and incapacity in several directions are among the unavoidable disabilities of their position,—many have, nevertheless, instructed and elevated themselves to a very creditable extent, who, previous to conversion, possessed no scholarship at all; and it would be equally unreasonable, cruel, and unjust to utter a harsh expression against so useful and self-denying a body of men as our leaders are. But the effects of this imperfect state of things are of course none the less to be regretted. It is very desirable to have this means of grace—our class meetings—improved, rendered more instructive, and more stimulative of divine things. Men grow tired of hearing the same things, very little varied, rung incessantly into their ear. If any thing could be done to impart a larger amount of Bible instruction in our classes, so as to do away with that monotonous sing-song style in which they are ordinarily conducted, we think it would be an improvement. We should have the word of God read more or less in all our devotional meetings, and by this means many might be instructed in the doctrines of the Bible who have not the means of instruction at home; and a large amount of gospel truth might, in time, be brought under their attention in this way. New views of divine truth would thus dawn on the mind, material for pious

meditation would be obtained, and the soul be furnished with that spiritual pabulum essential to its growth, improvement, and stability.

A more diligent pastoral oversight. The leadership in Methodism is designed to supplement this department of ministerial labour. It is easy to apprehend that when a preacher has to attend to ten or twenty different societies it is impossible for him to exercise the supervision that is desirable in person. He cannot render himself ubiquitous. His visits are often paid at very considerable intervals; they may be hailed with joy by the people, and he may be the means of transfusing spiritual life and vigour into the church when he goes, but his visits being few and perhaps far between, some poor unstable soul that he might have advised with, reclaimed, and brought back to the society, had he been present to look after him, may have quite abandoned the fold, or, as we term it, "left society." This is an evil that rises out of the constitution and arrangements of connexionalism; but if we would have the benefits of the system we must submit to unavoidable evils.

The division of Circuits in populous districts will meet in part the demand for increased pastoral oversight; but many Circuits will always demand a large amount of physical toil in travelling long journeys on foot, and this will not only trench on the time for family visitation, but also by exhausting the energies of body and mind, disable a man for the proper performance of the duty.

In large towns where much time is not consumed in travelling the duty may be more easily performed, and it is certainly of vital importance to the interests of our Societies. The Conference gives the expression of its opinion in relation to this matter, and the importance it attaches to the due performance of the duty by exacting forty family visits per week from every junior minister, regardless alike of the differences of locality, population, or the extra demands of pulpit preparation. This gives in the year nearly 2,100 family visits, which is nearly as much work, *to do it well*, as a man of ordinary strength can perform.

Now it might be reasonably asked, when we look at this rule, what more can be done in this department of ministerial labour? Why demand a more watchful vigilance over societies to preserve and establish wavering souls? The answer is, first, because it is not done. The rule, we fear is not adhered to nor observed according to its own terms. And in our judgment it cannot be done with due regard to the right performance of other imperative duties. It is too great a tax on human nature. Second, when attempted, it is not *well done;* family calls are set down for pastoral visits, where religious instructions are not given, where children are not noticed nor catechised, where the Scriptures are not

read, and where the members of the family are not called together for prayer. Men are in hazard of tampering with their own feelings of conscientiousness in their attempts to meet the letter of the law.

We think the number of these visits should be diminished, and the quality enhanced. If we have reason to think that a member of society is growing cold in his love to Christ, if he is running after earthly pleasure, if he has ceased to meet in class, he should be carefully looked after, seriously talked to, solemnly warned of his danger, or encouraged to start afresh. This sort of work is far too important to be hurried through; it demands patience, care, fidelity, and earnest love to souls. This part of a minister's business has much importance attached to it in the Scriptures; it is said to be one of our chief duties, and solemn condemnation is pronounced on those who neglect it. Ezek. xxxiv.

Great care is required in dealing with cases of this kind. The devices of Satan are diversified and numerous, and it demands skill and discernment to meet them. It is to be presumed that in all cases of religious declension and instability, religion is either not understood as to its true nature, or not enjoyed. The very terms in which it is described in the Scriptures import its matchless value: "The unspeakable gift," the "great salvation," the "living water," the "treasure hid in a field," the "pearl of great price," and many similar forms of expression indicate its inestimable worth.

If religious professors saw this subject in its true light, surely we should not have to mourn over so many falling from their stedfastness and turning away from the holy commandments delivered unto them. It is the very thing to satisfy the longings of the human soul; and the light of the sun is not more adapted or more agreeable to the eye than the light of God's truth is adapted to meet the wants and desires of the soul. When weak believers fail to see these things in their true light, pains should be taken to instruct them in the truth as it is in Jesus.

Broader views of Christian experience exhibited in the pulpit, and more urgent appeals to believers as to the duty of advancement in the divine life. We are afraid, generally speaking, that the type of our religion is low, the vast body of christians are below the Royal standard in holiness and joy. True Christianity is an intensely earnest thing, and its real influence is to break down and subdue all things to itself, until it assimilate the entire man to the glorious image of Christ. God will have no sharer in his throne: his name is "jealous;" he asks, he demands the whole heart, and nothing short of this will satisfy him. But no man who thus yields himself to God in his own way can be fickle and unstable in his attachment to his religion. Entire devotion to God implies

decision of character. He that is wholly the Lord's belongs to none else. His eye is simple; his intentions are pure, and the supreme desire of his soul is to love God with all his heart and mind, with all his soul and strength. He sets the Lord and his religion first, and everything else is regarded as subordinate. Now the question is, do we in our public ministrations insist sufficiently on this entire consecration to God? David prays, "Unite my heart to fear thy name." Our people require this unity of heart Godward. Their religion ought to be the grand master principle, and it should be continually urged on them that their safety and happiness are identified only with advancement. No man ought to rest satisfied with present attainments, while such ocean fulness lies before him; by an onward movement alone can he become, "stablished, strengthened, settled in the faith." A good man has nothing to do with his past experience in the sense of present acceptance and safety. He cannot subsist on past experience, he cannot be justified before God on the ground of former actions, he must live to God to-day, and press into the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of peace *now*. Virtuous character can be formed only by virtuous actions. Men become strong in the religious sense only by the continued exercise of spiritual gifts. It is well known that wicked men, through long continuance of evil habits, seem absolutely divested of the power of resisting or overcoming their evil propensities, and evil of all kinds is drawn upon them as the result. So of the good. A man may persevere in habits of devotion until they become "second nature" to him, and it is easier for him to do right than wrong. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin because he is born of God." All experience and observation confirm us in the conviction that this high and exceedingly desirable state of grace can be obtained only by patient continuance in well-doing after we believe and are saved through the blood of the Lamb. This is the reward of continuance in well-doing—of going on to perfection.

This course of conduct should be incessantly urged upon our people from the pulpit; our discourses should be so framed as to keep the necessity of advancement in grace continually before their eyes. It is often said of us as a community that we are more successful in getting people into the church than in keeping them. It is evidently intimated in the observation that there is a defect either in the shepherding, the pastoral oversight, or otherwise there is deficiency in the wisdom, the weight, or the suitability of our public ministrations, which is an equally grave charge. Now, be this insinuation true or otherwise, it should lead to deep searchings of heart. It is painful to think of a tree full of blossom bearing no fruit, and of good seed sown in the field failing to wave in

; inviting the sickle of the reaper and bearing sixty or an
d fold. To add many to the church, and then, from any
o lose them, produces feelings of as deep discouragement as
ll be imagined. It behoves our ministers to be as well
ed as possible, in the possession of theological truth in all
plitudes and forms, so as to meet satisfactorily the ever-re-
; necessities of the people; to lead them through the length
eadth of divine revelation, that they may enjoy the good
. But it is of equal importance that we should have a
dge of their spiritual state and feelings, that we may be
give to every man his portion of meat in due season.
lly,—after all we can do by warning, entreaty, or expostu-
we shall be unable to achieve our highest wishes in restoring
t have backslidden in heart, or in establishing every waver-
ul. There will ever be a class, and we fear a large one, who
ir unstable ways will produce ministerial anxiety and sorrow.
men will continue running about from one place of worship
ther, hearing first this preacher and then another, but
ecoming the wiser for such pretended advantages. These
men who are ever learning but never coming to a correct
dge of the truth, still continuing ignorant of the best means
ncement in an intelligent and useful piety.
he parable of the sower we are warned against expecting too
in certain quarters, although the seed of the word may be
nd also sown with a skilful hand. Out of the four classes
whom the seed is sown only one class brings forth unto per-
, or in such a way as pleases the divine Sower. We shall
far wrong in taking this proportion as still holding good in
to the preaching of the word and the degress of success by
it is attended. At the best human nature is but a poor
and it requires a large amount of patience and forbearance
it on, in spite of its instability and waywardness, in the
erlasting.
we should recollect that God in his long-suffering has borne
ith us in the midst of our follies and imperfections, and in
anner we must bear with the ignorant and unstable soul.
plants may by careful nursing be made eventually strong
althy, and reward the pains taken with them; so imperfect
rs may be brought nearer to God, the fountain of spiritual
d power, and may at length be made strong in the Lord and
power of his might. The great Father of all looks down
ll his children in their different degrees of weakness and
ection with feelings of tenderness and compassion. He
us for our encouragement that he does not break the
l reed, nor quench the smoking flax; so we must encourage
oncerning our unstable brethren, though there may not be

much material for hope to feed upon. And even supposing that our efforts go unrewarded, as far as the objects of our anxiety are concerned, we shall not go unrewarded by him who employs us in our work, and who engages to sustain us in it. We are answerable to him for our fidelity in relation to the performance of our work, though we may not be held responsible to the same extent for our success in it. "Now we beseech you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men."

T. SMITH.

ART. V.—BAPTISM.*

JESUS CHRIST instituted two ordinances for the observance of his Church. Of those ordinances the first is Baptism, which sets forth symbolically the purification of the heart by the Holy Spirit. The second is the Supper of the Lord, which is an emblem of the atonement made for sinners by the Saviour.

A vast amount of various opinion has for centuries existed amongst Christians respecting Baptism and the Supper, producing not a little bitterness and strife. The object of these ordinances is clear and easily understood. When a person becomes a Christian he should enter the Church; and as baptism is the introduction to Church membership, he should be baptised. While a man continues a Christian he should receive the emblems of the body and blood of the Lord, in remembrance of the atonement made for his sins by the Son of God. There is something so simple, so apparently obvious about these things, that it seems strange so much should have been said about them, and with such a divergence of idea.

It is our purpose to examine the subject of Baptism, not as it is found in the writings of men, but as it is set forth in the word of God.

Baptism is an ordinance which Jesus did not himself originate. It had been in existence hundreds of years previous to his advent. When he was about thirty years old he came from Galilee into Judea, and found John baptising multitudes of people in the

* An Essay read at Birmingham, in October, 1866, at the First Session of the Literary Association of the Tunstall District.

neighbourhood of the Jordan. John baptised unto repentance, and he often reminded the people that his was an inferior work, and a symbolic baptism. "I," said he, "baptise you with water unto repentance, but there cometh one after me, the thongs of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose, he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost." With the form of words used by the disciples of Jesus, as they baptised the multitudes which came to them, we are not acquainted. The disciples baptised more people than John, but for what purpose it is not stated. But neither John's nor that of the disciples of Jesus was Christian baptism. John did not baptise in any name, and the disciples of Jesus did not understand Christianity. Jesus instituted Christian baptism after his resurrection, when he commanded his apostles to go unto all nations, to teach, and to baptise in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The principal differences amongst Protestant Christians, in connection with this subject, refer to the *persons* who should be baptised, and to the *manner* of baptising them.

Who then ought to be baptised? All who belong to the Church of God. Who then belong to the Church of God? All who believe in Jesus Christ, and all who are incapable of such belief. When a man, who has never had any connection with Christianity, has been induced to believe the doctrines of the Bible and desires to become a member of the Church, he ought, unquestionably, to submit to baptism. Such submission is an acknowledgment that his past life has been wrong, and a declaration that his future life in connection with Christian ethics shall be right. With reference to what has been called "believers' baptism" we have at present no controversy. But we have asserted that such persons as are incapable of exercising faith in Jesus belong to God. And it is incredible that infants, idiots, and madmen will be punished with everlasting destruction. Punishment depends on guiltiness; guiltiness arises from breaking known law. But the persons in question do not understand law. And even human governments, which are far less merciful than the Divine government, do not regard incapable persons as responsible. And infant damnation is a subject so shocking, so repulsive to feeling, so opposed to the nature of God, so contrary to the genius of the Scriptures, that amongst every million of men there is not one who believes in such a monstrosity. If then it can be proved that infants belong to the Church of God, no person, it is presumed, will oppose their baptism.

It is proper now to inquire whether, when the Church was originally organised, infants were made members; and if so, whether that Church has ever been abolished?

Previous to the calling of Abraham the church consisted of disconnected units, after that calling, of an associated aggregate.

When Abraham and the persons comprising his household were circumcised, the church was formed. Now, in connection with every organised body of men, intended for perpetuity, there must be some form of recognition. Circumcision was the form given to Abraham, and to whomsoever was desirous of belonging to the household of faith. Of necessity every command must be given to men, though children be included in the things commanded. Infants could not circumcise themselves, nor could they receive an order of circumcision save through their fathers. And yet infants were the only persons to be circumcised, after the first cases, excepting the proselytes. If Abraham and his servants had been sent forth to propagate the faith, the formula given to them would undoubtedly have been similar to the one afterwards given to the apostles. The persons in the Trinity might not have been specified, but still the form would probably have been—Go, teach all nations, circumcising them in the name of God. And when the head of a family believed the preachers would unquestionably, and immediately, have circumcised all the male persons in his house.

In the days of the apostles the rite of introduction to church membership was changed, but the constitution of the church was not changed. Circumcision was abolished, but infant membership was not abolished. Some of the customs of the church were discontinued, others were introduced, but the church was the same. The difference between the church itself and the circumstantials of the church, is as clear and obvious as is the difference between beauty and dress.

It is scarcely necessary to formally prove the identity of the church of God from the days of Abraham; but lest such an omission should be considered a defect, we will refer to Scripture for proof of that identity.

Abraham believed God, and his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. Circumcision did not make, it simply declared him to be a servant of God. St. Paul states that his faith preceded his circumcision, and that he was justified before he was circumcised. Faith, before the advent of Jesus, was essential to membership: faith, since that advent, has been necessary to membership. This alone would establish the identity of the church of God. Circumcision was the sign of that faith; baptism is the sign of the Christian faith; but both are as distinct from the faith itself as the kernel is distinct from the shell that encloses it.

Jesus Christ was a member of the Jewish church—all his disciples were members of that church. Their membership continued but did not commence when they became his disciples. Previous to his calling them they were in covenant with God, and believed that God would send a Deliverer into the world. In recognising Jesus as that deliverer they became his disciples. And if the whole Jewish nation had received Jesus, they would have continued in

covenant with God. They unchurched themselves by rejecting the Messiah.

By St. Paul the ancient church was regarded as an olive tree, and members were considered as branches. Those members which rejected the Saviour were broken off, and unnatural branches, because they received Jesus, were grafted into the olive tree. Here the identity of the church is set forth by the most favoured and most able of all the apostles. Even the rejected branches were to be re-united if the cause of their having been cast away should be discontinued. If, then, in the organization of the church infants were made members by the same right as their fathers, if infant membership has not been discontinued, should they not be so made now? But in the word of God there is no record of infant membership having been discontinued. And if God has not discarded infants, the church has no power to discard them. As, then, the command to make them members is still in force, and as when for two thousand years circumcision was the rite of introduction to the church infants were made members by that rite, so now, baptism being the rite of introduction, infants should be made members by baptism.

Jesus Christ recognised children as belonging to God: "But," Jesus said, "suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Now, whichever sense be attributed to the phrase "kingdom of heaven," whether it be said to mean the church state in heaven or the church state on earth, the conclusion is the same, that is, that children in the Christian sense belong to God. And all persons who are the Lord's should be in the church, but none should be admitted to membership but by baptism. "Little children," then, should be baptised.

It has been said that Jesus did not mean that infants were members of the church, but that such as children, or such like, were of the "kingdom of heaven." But TOIOUTOS is not in any part of the New Testament rendered either "such like," or "such as." In every instance where such phrases occur either TOIOUTOS is not used, or some other word is used with it.

But if the only fitness of men for church membership arises from child-likeness, why should children be rejected? What should exclude them but a want of fitness? For what was the guest bound hand and foot and cast into outer darkness but a want of the proper garment? If children belong to God, if when dead they become members of the church triumphant, why should they not be members of the church militant? If God receives them to himself and glorifies them, should pardoned sinners reject them? No persons go to heaven who have not been the Lord's on earth. It is an axiom in physics, in logic, in philosophy, that the less is contained in the greater. The church in heaven is greater than

the church on earth. The church state here is a preparation, an introduction to the church state there. All deceased infants go to heaven. Are then such persons as God receives into heaven to be refused by man the privilege of church membership on earth? That would be strange indeed for man to reject such persons as God himself receives and crowns with everlasting felicity and glory.

It is proper before we pass from this part of the subject to notice the usual and principal objections to infant baptism.

It is said by some that instruction, repentance, and faith should precede baptism, and that as infants are incapable of these things, they should not be baptised. Those who exclude infants from baptism, because of incapacity, generally alledge as a reason the commission given to the apostles. Jesus commanded them to go into all the world, to teach and baptise all nations. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." It is suprising that the obvious fallacy of this objection has not prevented its frequent use. Little discernment is required to discover that if because in collating the first two gospels in connection with the great commission, the words *teach* and *believe* are found to precede the word baptise, that therefore no persons who cannot receive instruction and exercise faith should be baptised, that all the three words, teach, believe, and baptise, precede the word save. If the words be taken as they stand, and if it be demanded that instruction and faith must precede baptism, then all the three, instruction, faith, and baptism, must precede salvation. But do those who urge this form of words against infant baptism believe in the soundness of their own objection? What! with the utmost severity of logic, that no person who has not been instructed, who has not believed, and who has not been baptised, can be saved. If they do not they should be honest and give up the objection. For if because an infant cannot believe, it should not be baptised, then, because it cannot believe it will certainly be damned; for "he that believeth not shall be damned." But the objection, if sound, would ruin infants doubly. First, it refuses to baptize them because they cannot believe; secondly, it refuses to save them because they have not been baptized. But we will leave this form of words to the maturer cogitations of the objectors.

Another classification of words used in the New Testament, is, "repent and be baptised." From this some have inferred that in all cases repentance should precede baptism. Here again, of course, infants are to be kept at a distance, for certainly they cannot repent. And if they could, why should they? Of what should they repent? How those persons who are bent on chasing the "little children" out of every pew, and aisle, and corner, and vestibule of the church, perpetually confound things that differ. It is men-

tally, morally, and theologically impossible for any persons to repent of sins of which they are not guilty. Of what, then, we ask again, should infants repent? They are not sinners. They have broken no law. Unconscious babes, with minds that never thought sinfully, with hearts that never felt angry, with tongues that never spoke rudely, are classified with sinners of Jerusalem, with men whose hearts were full of all evil, and whose hands were stained with the blood of the Son of God. Notwithstanding all the variation of thought and strife of sentiment existing in the world, such strange associations are nowhere else to be found. It is said that misery makes strange bed-fellows, and the fallacy that places children, who are as free from transgression as the mountain air is from deadly miasma, in juxtaposition with the sinners of Jerusalem, is miserable indeed.

Another objection to infant baptism is, that infants understand nothing, that they cannot make engagements. Infants can, unquestionably, understand as much now as they could three thousand years since, and they are quite as able to make engagements now as they were then. Their incapacity was no bar to their circumcision, and yet St. Paul says that a person circumcised is bound to keep the whole law. The Gospel is far more simple than the rituals of Moses, and faith is more easily understood than the inflexions of the law. Why then should incapacity be urged in connection with what is simple, when it was never urged in connection with what was complex? Children, in olden times, became debtors to the law when they were eight days old. Then why should not persons now, during infancy, become recognised heirs of the promises of the Gospel?

Again, it has been urged against infants that baptism is a positive institution, and that persons observing such an institution should be authorised to do so by a positive precept. Now, when a conclusion is true, both its premises are true. Assertion needs proof. But it is nowhere in the Bible stated, that a positive precept is necessary to authorise the observance of a positive institution; while the practice of the entire church shews the fallacy of the assertion. The Lord's Supper is a positive institution. Females are nowhere commanded to observe that institution, and yet there is no section of the church in which the females do not, equally with the males, receive the emblems of the body and blood of the Lord.

The last objection which we shall notice, and which we consider as altogether favourable to our view of the subject, is the *silence* of the New Testament respecting infant baptism. Now, it is impossible that silence, a mere nothing, should be against dedicating children to God by baptism. Indeed, the objection destroys itself. The case stands thus—the New Testament does not command the baptism

of infants; the New Testament does not forbid the baptism of infants. Whether silence will make for or against a thing depend altogether on circumstances.

The New Testament is silent about infant circumcision, and yet infants were the only persons to be circumcised, excepting in the cases of proselytes. Men were commanded to be baptised; men were forbidden to be circumcised. Nothing is said about infants in either case; but who doubts that infants were included in the proscription of circumcision? Why, then, should they be excluded from the command respecting baptism? There was more need for a specific precept to forbid infant circumcision than there was for such a precept to authorise infant baptism.

But would the New Testament have been silent if the apostles had not baptised the children with their parents? The Scribes, the Parisees, the Saducees, were ever ready to make objections to innovations. Would they dispute about washing hands and forget their children? Would they firmly insist on their Abrahamic descent and silently witness the setting aside of one of the principal features of Abraham's covenant? If John, if Jesus, if the apostles had unnaturally thrust away the children, the whole Jewish nation would have burst forth into uncontrollable indignation. Nay, an exclusion of the little ones would have been an enormous stone of stumbling to the apostles themselves. For two thousand years every infant in the community had been received into the bosom of the church on the eighth day of its existence. And now, according to the objection, a father is to be in the church, and his children among the Gentiles. The time of reformation is come; the Messiah, long expected, has at length appeared, and one of his principal actions, they find, is to unchurch their children. They had been taught that the days of Messiah would be days of mercy and glory, of transcendant displays of goodness to their country; and he commences his work by placing their infant offspring amongst strangers and aliens. What! and the Pharisees say nothing, nor the Scribes, nor the Sadducees, the authorized instructors and guardians of the privileges of the people? He who can believe so must be credulous almost to fatuity.

We have now given some reasons for baptising infants; we have answered the principal objections to that practice; we now proceed to consider the *manner* of Christian baptism. Sometimes the manner of observing a thing is important, but in no instance can the manner be as important as the thing itself. Sometimes the mode of observance is exalted, so as to depreciate the thing observed. Jesus Christ and his apostles were not at all ritualistic, and they never laid much stress on circumstantials. Preaching the gospel, for instance, is of the first importance; but the New Testament contains no regulations about the manner of preaching,

whether it is sitting, or standing, or walking. Prayer again is of the greatest importance; but men are nowhere told in what manner to pray, whether standing, or kneeling, or sitting. The same might be said of the Lord's supper, which some partake of sitting, others standing, while a third party kneel. And he who should say that because others do not preach nor pray in the same manner as he does these things, therefore they do not preach nor pray, would manifest more arrogance and impertinence than judgment and discretion. But there has been little said about the manner to be observed in preaching and praying, nor would much have been said about the manner of baptizing people, if a small section of the church had not asserted that the only proper method was, to plunge backwards under water.

In general a person who affirms more than he can prove makes a greater noise than another who has in hand a better and a clearer case. That section of the church that baptised by immersion, waxing bold, became defiant, and volumes of polemics is the result.

As no directions referring to the manner of baptism were given by Jesus, nor by the apostles, the people who baptised by submersion fell back on the definition of BAPTIZO, and on certain narratives and allusions contained in the New Testament.

There are two Greek words of similar sound and meaning, and which are frequently used both by the Seventy and by the writers of the New Testament. Those words are BAPTO and BAPTIZO. And though BAPTO is never used in connection with Christian baptism, yet as BAPTIZO is one of its derivatives, it cannot be improper to devote a little attention to its import.

Lexicographers are authorities in their definitions of words when these definitions agree with the general usuage of words. If, for instance, an author should say that BAPTO and BAPTIZO mean to dip, to plunge, to immerge, he would not give the full meaning of those words, for they have most certainly other significations.

It cannot be proved in connection with the use of either of these words, in any part of the oracles of God, that absolute submersion took place. But frequently where the words occur it would be impossible in the nature of things that such submersion could take place. So that a definition which should exclude immersion would be a more just one than that which should make them mean immersion only. Both the words partake of the nature of generics, and, like hundreds of others, they have a variety of significations. As then the New Testament contains no specifications relating to the manner of baptism, we infer with undoubted propriety, that the validity of baptism cannot possibly depend on the method. If in the name of the Trinity water is used, whether

for the purpose of aspersion, immersion, or affusion, the baptism is unboubtedly valid.

BAPTO is found in the Septuagint about twenty times, and it has been rendered variously by the translators of King James. In Leviticus it is used five times at least; thrice it means to dip a finger in blood or oil for the purpose of sprinkling, and twice it is connected with the ceremony of cleansing persons and houses from leprosy. Referring to this cleansing it is not necessary to say more than that a living bird, a piece of cedar wood, a bunch of hyssop, and a piece of scarlet were baptised in the blood of a slain bird. He who can suppose that submersion was practised here may nurture his supposition without fear of molestation from us. The word is used again in the well-known expression of Job, "If I wash myself in snow-water, and make my hands never so clean, yet shalt thou baptise me in mire, and my own clothes shall abhor me." Now the violence demanded for a total submersion in mire would be enough to destroy life.

We pass the case of Naaman, the Syrian leper, in connection with whom washing and baptizing mean the same thing, to notice the humiliation of Nebuchadnezzar. This king had a dream which augured evil; and as interpreted by Daniel, it was fulfilled a year afterwards. "For Nebuchadnezzar was driven from men, and he ate grass as oxen, and his body was baptized (EBAPHE) by the dew of heaven, till his hair was enlarged as lions hair, and his nails as the claws of birds. In what manner does dew baptise persons? By falling on them as softly and gently as the light reflected by the moon. Nebuchadnezzar's was unquestionably baptism by aspersion, a baptism, too, which was repeated every night, till his hair and his nails had grown to unwonted proportions.

BAPTO occurs three times in the New Testament, once in connection with the sop given to Judas, again in connection with the request of the rich man, and lastly in the Apocalypse Jesus is said to have on a garment dipped in blood. The language used here has reference to war, and soldiers are not accustomed to submerge their clothes in blood previously to putting them on. Unquestionably the baptism of soldiers on a field of battle is by aspersion. The sense here demand that BEBAMMENON should be rendered sprinkled. Wycliffe, near five hundred years since, had the good sense to see this; and he accordingly translated the passage: "And he was clothid in a cloth spreynt with blood, and his name was clepid the Son of God." The Rheims version has, "And he was clothed with a garment sprinkled with bloud."

We now come to BAPTIZO, and it is not needful to give the meanings of the word found in Greek vocabularies. For neither those who asperse, nor those who immerse, would leave the subject

settled by lexicographical definitions. For whatever be the
ıl* import of the word, it is certain that in the New Testa-
it does not always, if ever, mean submersion.
› pass the baptisms of pots, brass pans, and couches, and also
eference to the baptism of the Hebrew nation in the cloud
ı the sea, and proceed to notice those parts where, if at all,
ord implies to sink in water.
ɜ case for immersion is this: John baptised in the river Jordan,
n Enon, because at that place there was much water; Jesus
ł to have come up "out of" the water; and Philip with the
ch went down "into" the water, and came up "out of" the
. It is asserted by some that these statements imply bap-
by immersion.
w, the whole strength of the circumstances which are thought
vour plunging, is contained in prepositions. But to say
ng of the latitude of Greek particles, it will shortly be shown
hose particles are unfavourable to the idea of baptism under
. We notice first the Baptism of John in the Jordan. The
sition EN is often used in connection with baptism, and in the
rised version it is generally rendered, *with*. We will not
; that John did not baptise in the river, but this cannot be
d from the language used. John is said to have baptised in
, but there is, of course, a great difference between being *in*
ɔe and *under* a place. The same particle that would make
put multitudes of people under the Jordan, would make him
ıultitudes more under the town of Enon. If EN be evidence
e instance, why not in the other? The people are never said
baptised *in* the Holy Ghost, but in every instance where
baptism took place the particle EN is used. "I," said John,
ıl times, "baptise you EN UDATI, *with* water, but he shall
se you EN TNEUMATI AGIO, *with* the Holy Spirit." Baptism
ıter, is an expression unknown to the New Testament. The
ɜnt is invariably said to be applied to the person, and never
e contrary. When, therefore, John is said to have baptised in
ın, in Enon, in Bethany, it is evident that these terms are
to denote the places *where*, and not the *manner how*, he bap-
the people. The EN by no means proves that the multitudes
baptised in the bed of the river. For in scores, not to say
ındreds of instances, EN is rendered *at*, *by*, *with*, and other-

And this variety of renderings is demanded by the sense of
ture. The Seventy in the second Psalm have, "Thou shalt
hem EN RABDO SIDERA, *with* a rod of iron." St. Paul asks
orinthians, "What will ye; *with* a rod I should come to you?"

* BAPTANO is used more than forty times and PARAPTOMA is found more
wenty times in the New Testament, and neither word is ever used with
ginal signification.

In these passages, and hundreds might be produced, substitute *in* for *with*, and the sense will be lost.

John was careful to set forth the difference in *kind*, between his baptism and the Saviour's. But not one word escapes him about the *manner*, nor, indeed, is that subject ever hinted at by the writers of the Scriptures. Is it not strange that this positive institution, which evermore demands specifications, should be left unguarded at one of its principal entrances? We are told *when* John baptised, with *what* he baptised, but not *how* he baptised.

John's was a symbolic baptism. Jesus Christ's was the real baptism. We know in what *manner* Jesus baptised. And as it is proper for the real to explain the typical, for the substance to form the appearance of the shade, so it is right for the manner of Christ's baptism to explain the manner of John's. As then Jesus *shed forth, poured out, sent down* the Spirit *on* the people, so John shed forth, poured out, sent down water *on* the people, *at* the Jordan, *by* the Jordan, or if any one demands, *in* the Jordan.

But in connection with this river baptism, Jesus is said to have come "out of" the water, and as some stress is laid on that phrase it is proper to pay some attention to the circumstance.

The preposition APO, here rendered "out of," is generally rendered *from*. We will give a few examples and then the result of an examination of St. Matthew's gospel for the sake of this word. When the false and idle servant stood before his lord, his lord said to the other servants, "Take, therefore, the talent, AP'AUTOU, from him." In the last day Jesus will say to the wicked, "Depart, AP' EMOU, from me." "While he was yet speaking, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came with a great crowd, APO, from the chief priests and elders of the people. In St. Matthew's gospel, APO occurs 119 times. Sixty-nine times it is rendered "*from*," and ten times "out of." The evidences, therefore, that Jesus came "*from*" the water, and not "out of" the water, are sixty nine against ten; and the probabilities that he was *not* put under the waters of the Jordan, are many against one.

We will now briefly glance at John's baptising in Enon, because of the many waters of that place. *Many* and *much* are relative terms, the import of which depends altogether on surrounding circumstances. To an ordinary labourer fifty would be many pounds. To the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a thousand pounds would be few. To a plough-boy the knowledge of grammar, of geography, of arithmetic, would be much. To a philosopher that knowledge, with considerable additions, would be little.

John baptised in a wilderness. Vast multitudes of people surrounded him every day. Many of them came from a distance. A wilderness is not a place where water abounds. Indeed, it is the absence of water that creates a desert. Armies and tourists have

often suffered much while passing as rapidly as possible through deserts. In Judea there is only one river, brooks are few, and dry half the year; hence the aptness of Job's comparison, "My friends are as deceitful as a brook." If John's business had been unconnected with water, he must for the sake of the multitudes have performed his duties at the very places where he baptised.

In the days of Hezekiah, Senacherrib, king of Assyria, came against the cities of Judah with a great army. The Hebrew king summoned his counsellors together, and they decided to stop the fountains of waters, and the brook that ran through the midst of the country; for why, it was asked, should the kings of Assyria come and find much water? A king of England who should call together his friends to stop the fountains, to destroy the brooks, to say nothing about the lakes and rivers, would hardly be in a sound state of mind. But the Judean king accomplished his purpose. He stopped the springs and destroyed the brook, while the alien army was in the country. Every reader of the Bible knows what feuds there used to be in Palestine about a well that could be filled by a few baskets of earth. But some persons while descanting on the many waters of Enon, fancy themselves, and John with them, in the midst of the Cumbrian lakes. The multitudes that flocked to John's ministry needed much water, irrespective of Baptism, both for their many ablutions and for the necessary purposes of life.

But it is nowhere said that the Saviour baptised in the Jordan, in Enon, in Bethany, nor anywhere else for the sake of much water. And yet myriads of myriads of people came to him and were baptised by his disciples. The truth is, that while John was stationary, Jesus was rapidly passing through the cities and villages of Judea and Galilee, seldom or never staying more than a day or two in the same place. And almost anywhere he would find as much water as would serve to baptise the multitudes that came to him, in the same manner as the dew baptised Nebuchadnezzar, and as the spray of the sea and the moisture of the cloud baptised the millions of Hebrews as they journied to the Promised Land.

But the circumstances which are thought to give definiteness and force to the idea of immersion, are found in connection with the baptism of the Eunuch by Philip. Both are said to have gone down "into" the water. Both are said to have come up "out of" the water. Here, then, the circumstances are complete. And to this renowned narrative those who baptise by immersion rush, not only to vindicate their own conduct, but also to vanquish completely, and to silence for ever, their sprinkling brethren.

But if it should be granted that they went into water, still the difference is great between going into, and going under water. Jesus went into a mountain to pray, into a mountain and was

metamorphosed, into a mountain and sat to teach. But who supposes that in these instances "into" is proof of submersion. Cattle generally go down into water to drink, and myriads of children every year go down from the cliffs, take off their boots and stockings, and walk into the sea. To orientals who do not use these articles, and whose feet often need washing, walking into water would be a most agreeable practice.

But did Philip go into the water? Is the language used so exclusively definite as to allow of nothing else? We will again give examples, and then the result of a careful reading of the book of Acts, for the sake of the words in question. And in truth, the case for immersion is altogether one of particles. Those who plunge have nothing so clear to show with reference to mode as the baptism with the Spirit, who was sent down, poured out, and shed forth, on the people. For even if any one wish to press into his service, the expression, "buried by baptism into his death," to say nothing of the strong rhetoric of the phrase, nor of the impossibility of plunging into the form of Christ's death, he must forget the Jewish mode of burial, and remember only the English, before the expression can render him any assistance.

But with pleasure we approach the two prepositions made famous by their connection with Philip and the Eunuch. Having unexpectedly found water by the roadside in the desert, the treasurer of Candace commanded his chariot to stand. "And they both went down "into" (EIS) the water, and he baptised him. And when they came up "out of" (EK) the water, the Spirit caught away Philip.

EIS, like every other Greek preposition, is rendered by a variety of English prepositions. Indeed, to a person who for the first time takes hold of a work in Greek, the particles are almost as puzzling as the inflexions of the verbs.

EIS is frequently rendered *on*. In the various passages of this nature, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," the preposition is, EIS. "They shall look on (EIS) him whom they pierced." "For (EIS) what, or wherefore didst thou doubt." "Here is a lad with five barley loaves, and two small fishes; but what are these among (EIS) so many? These words spake Jesus, and lifted his eyes toward (EIS) heaven." "Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, she fell at (EIS) his feet." "I am not sent but unto (EIS) the lost sheep of the house of Israel." "We all fell to (EIS) the earth."

With reference to EK, we need not select so many examples of variation, for unless EIS carry Philip and the Eunuch "into" the water, EK cannot bring them "out of" it.

"Many good works have I shown you from (EK) my Father." EK NEKRON is a phrase that occurs in the New Testament about

fifty times,* dead," and it is always rendered, "from the dead." Jesus rose from (EK, scarcely out of) the supper." "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene unto (EIS) the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from (EK) the sepuchre." Here in one verse both the prepositions connected with the baptism of the Eunuch are found, and they are translated *unto* and *from*. If they had been so rendered in the narrative of that event, the best part of the evidence for immersion would have been wanting.

The Acts of the Apostles consist of twenty-eight chapters. In those chapters EIS is found 283 times. Of those 283 times it is rendered "before," once; "by," once; "throughout," once; "wherein," once; "concerning," once; "among," twice; "upon," five times; "toward," six times; "on," seven times; "for," nine times; "at," eleven times; "in," seventeen times; "*into*," eighty-seven times; and "TO," with "UNTO," *one hundred* and *twenty-two* times. So that there are 122 evidences in the Book in which the narrative is found that Philip and the Eunuch went "*to*" the water, against 87 that they went "into" the water.

EK, the other preposition, is found in the Acts of the Apostles 89 times, and it is rendered "by," once; "with," three times; "on," five times; "*out of*," *eighteen times;* and "FROM," THIRTY times. Here then it is stated thirty times that those famous brethren came "from" the water, against eighteen that they came "out of" it.

As time† does not permit us to notice other allusions and narratives, we conclude by stating, that we have shown that children were made members when the Church was organised, that the Church has never been reconstructed, and that infant membership has never been abolished; that as when circumcision was the initiatory rite of the Church, children were made members by that rite, so now baptism being the rite of introduction, that children should be declared members by baptism.

We have shown, secondly, that in both Testaments BAPTO sometimes means to sprinkle; we have referred to the diversity of signification connected with BAPTIZO as relating to the washing of hands, of pots, of brass pans, and of couches; as relating to the double sprinkling of the Hebrew nation in the cloud and in the sea; as relating to affusion in the baptism of the early Christians by the Spirit; we have shown that baptism *in* water is a phrase unknown to the New Testament, that the element was always applied to the people, that much water in the wilderness of Judea would be a very small quantity, and that the much would be necessary for other purposes than baptism; that EIS is generally

* Forty-eight times "from the dead," and once "of the dead."

† Only fifty minutes were allowed for the reading of the Essay.

rendered "to," and that EK and APO are almost always rendered "from;" and from all these, and other things which might be alluded to, we have an undoubted right to state that that baptism is valid, irrespective of mode, in connection with which water is used, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

E. I.

ART. VI.—THE NATURE AND NECESSITY OF REGENERATION.*

I. THE NATURE OF REGENERATION.

TO "*regenerate*" is to *reproduce*, or to produce *anew*; hence "*regeneration*" is that mighty change whereby a *natural* man is made a *spiritual* or *new* man; and he that was a child of the devil becomes by grace a child of God. For, as by our natural birth we are made in the likeness of fallen Adam, called the "*old man*" or the "*first man*," so by this new or spiritual birth we become new creatures, or "*spiritual men*," sons of God in Jesus Christ the *second* Adam.

In treating thus specially of "*regeneration*," we do not ignore or set aside the other essential parts in the great work included in the comprehensive term *salvation;* for that important term includes regeneration, pardon, adoption, justification, and sanctification, all of which are requisite to our happiness here and our glorification hereafter. Nor do we set forth regeneration as a separate and distinct work, wrought in the human heart at some undefined period, either anterior or posterior to the parts of this great work: but we consider it both possible and probable for the whole of these different operations to be going on at one and the same time.

1. *Regeneration is a spiritual change.* As set forth in the New Testament, it is a *new creation*, a *resurrection* from a state of spiritual death to a state of spiritual life; placing its subject in an entirely new position and thoroughly changing his mode of existence. It is not merely something done *for* a man, but is a

* The substance of an address delivered in Portland Place Chapel, Lincoln, on Thursday Evening, September 7th, 1865, before the members of the "Nottingham District Association of Primitive Methodist Ministers."

cal change wrought *within* him. In this important respect neration differs very materially from the pardon and justifica- of the sinner; these have been done *for* him, and done far y in the court of heaven, and he is dependent on the Spirit's imony for his knowledge of their being done. With regenera- it is far otherwise; he is conscious of it; he feels it; the marks signs are upon him; and he has something to show as evidence eof.

ot that it is a mere change in a man's physical and outward g, producing a corresponding change in his external habits and luct, as taught by some theologians. Personal cleanliness, ness of attire, comfortable dwellings, domestic economy, ghtness of conduct, Sabbath observance, and attendance on gious ordinances, are not regeneration, but may be the con- ent fruits of it. The regenerating influence acts upon the *er* man, and proceeds through and by it to reduce the *outer* to order. But these external reformations, when accompanied some religious dispositions, must not be taken for regeneration; it is quite possible for a man to be the subject of strong gious emotion, and under the influence of such emotion to nge his manner of life, and yet remain unregenerate and ved. He must be "*born again*," must be created anew in teousness and true holiness by the power of the Holy Spirit.

2. *In regeneration the mind is divinely illluminated.* This ntirely the work of the Holy Spirit, although he may employ a iety of agencies, instrumentalities, and means. The entrance the word giveth light; and hence its public ministration is the al instrumentality employed for this end. This invests the ssenger of truth with great authority, and lays him under solemn ponsibilities. But the minister is not the only agent nor the rd the only instrument thus employed; all regenerated persons, their christian and earnest prayers, may be co-workers with the rit, and the varied events of a mysterious providence may be ctified to this end.

But this *divine illumination* is not *direct inspiration*, as some e supposed; neither is it the bestowment of new attributes of id, as others have asserted. If a man be an intellectual dwarf ore his regeneration, he will be so after it, for regeneration will add one cubit to his stature. Or, if a man be uneducated and orant before his regeneration, he will remain so after it has taken ce, unless he applies himself to mental culture and the acquisi- n of knowledge; for divine illumination does not supersede the at and vigorous exercise of those mental powers with which he y be endowed. A man must *work*, and work diligently and tinuously, if he means to occupy a dignified position with iour to himself; for mere religious attainment and enjoyment,

however rich and abundant, will never supply the lack of intellectual industry. He may become an enthusiast, or he may become a holy and earnest man, but he will never become a great man. On the other hand, we do not wish to convey the idea that a man must be learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, or possess knowledge to understand all mysteries, in order that he may be wise unto salvation; but what we are anxious to establish is this—that it is through an enlightened understanding the heart is changed, and whilst the intellectual powers are the medium through which the regenerating light is communicated, they continue in their former condition. "For although there have been cases consequent on regeneration, where the varied powers of the mind have improved in a most remarkable, and almost miraculous manner, yet this does not prove that the invigorating of the mental faculties is immediately and directly a part of the regenerating process. It rather proves that these powers were possessed before, but lay dormant through the absence of a proper incentive, and that that incentive was regeneration, with its vigorous life and motive power. Foster has very truly said, 'that religion is a marvellous improver of the *sense* of uneducated persons, by creating in them a habit of serious thought.'" We may also add, that the glorious objects of the christian faith, the sublime imagery of the inspired book, the great realities of the divine life, and the transporting prospects of future glory, have a powerful tendency to whet and invigorate the mind.

The illumination of which we speak as being directly associated with regeneration, is the illumination of the Holy Spirit employing the divine, or other suited instrumentality, and acting on the human understanding, turning the person thus operated upon, from nature's darkness to God's most marvellous light. This act is sometimes spoken of as the removal of a veil, which had both obscured the vision, and excluded the light; but by this removal the power of vision is restored, and the entrance of light unobstructed.

(1.) This divine illumination makes the recipient acquainted with himself. A man's knowledge of himself is all-important, but most difficult to acquire, and can only be acquired by the assistance of this divine agency. The unregenerate man is naturally averse to this branch of knowledge, and it is one of the last lessons which he is willing to learn; but in regeneration a disposition for learning it is created. In this divine crucible he becomes childlike and docile, places himself at the great Teacher's feet, and anxiously waits to hear his voice. As he listens attentively to this gracious teaching his depravity, estrangement, and helplessness, become more and more apparent to him, until he abhors himself in dust and ashes. The ultimate results of his advancement in this knowledge are, a

feeling of entire dependence upon God, and the attainment of humility, gentleness, and charity.

(2.) By this divine illumination an extended knowledge of God is obtained. Before the communication of this light a man may have known much of God, as he revealed himself in his works, his providence, and his word; but this spiritual revelation opens before him an entirely new and interesting field of vision. He beholds God now as his reconciled Father, his faithful unchangeable Friend, and his loving, adorable Lord, who is justly entitled to his profound reverence, implicit confidence, and supreme worship.

(3.) By this divine illumination he is made acquainted with the things of God—with those *deep* things of God which are hidden from the carnal gaze. The secret of the Lord is now with him, and the new name is revealed unto him. The path of life is opened out in resplendent beauty, and he walks therein in the light of his Father's countenance. God is light, and he dwelleth in God, and God in him. With this effulgent and transforming light he has acquired a moral refinement, a sensibility of conscience, an integrity of principle, a purity of affection, an elevation of hope and aim, with such exalted views of the paternal character of God and the rectitude of his moral government as give to him dignity and nobility of character.

3. *In regeneration the heart is thoroughly renewed.* This great fact is taught by God himself, in his promise by Ezekiel, to give Israel a "*new heart.*" The term "*heart,*" as used in this promise, and in various other places of the inspired book, is a figurative expression. For, as the human heart is the most *vital* as well as the most *central* part of the physical system, and as the health and life of the body are dependent on its continuous and regular pulsation, the figure is borrowed to represent the vital and impulsive centre of man's moral being on which his feelings, emotions, and actions depend. We are not to suppose that the physical heart of man is any more the residence of his spirit than his exquisitely organised brain; but the figure is intended to convey the idea that the fountain of his moral being is corrupt, and that all his thoughts, imaginations, desires, propensities, and feelings are corrupted thereby, and that the bestowment of a "*new heart*" is his only salvation.

In the bestowment of this *new heart* there is no change of *substance*, neither is there any *extinction* or *addition*. The passions and affections are changed in their tone and temper, and a new direction given to them, but no old power or susceptibility of the heart is either extinguished or repressed, nor is any new power or attribute superadded. As in man's fall no passion or emotion was lost, but all his powers were diverted from their proper channel; so in his regeneration, no passion or emotion is gained, but

all his diverted powers are turned into their proper course. Regeneration takes a man's heart as it finds it, and operates upon the powers which are existing there, renewing and purifying them whilst it restores and directs them to their legitimate use and end.

For example, the believer *loved* before he was converted, but his love was either placed on objects which were unlawful, or it was set on lawful objects to a sinful degree; but in regeneration his affections were turned from those unlawful and unworthy objects, and are directed to God as an object worthy of his supreme love. And as that object is more lovely than those he had previously loved, and as his love is intensified by the communication of the Divine, he loves more ardently than he loved before. Some of the objects of his former affections are still retained, because they are such as ought not to be rejected. The husband still loves his wife, and the wife her husband; the parent still loves the child, and the child its parent; and the brother still loves the sister, and the sister her brother. Yea, it is probable these will love each other with a love more fervent now that these affections are purified and exalted. There are not wanting instances where regeneration has transformed the brutal husband, the estranged wife, the cruel parent, the ungrateful child, the unnatural brother, or the selfish sister into lovely and loving beings. But this does not prove that these persons were destitute of passion before their conversion, it rather proves "that sin had smothered the flame, and that regeneration has renewed and invigorated it."

Again. Before his conversion the believer felt the burning of anger, hatred, and jealousy; nor has regeneration extinguished those fires, they still burn within him, but are purified and turned from one class of objects to another. We are now speaking of those feelings of holy indignation against sin, and that sacred jealousy for the Lord of Hosts which have characterised the most holy and devoted men of every age. Did not these feelings burn with holy intensity in the hearts of Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Nehemiah, and Ezra, and in the heart of the meek and compassionate Saviour and is not he the model after which the Holy Spirit regenerates and fashions his disciples?

We may also observe, that man is naturally susceptible of joy and sorrow, confidence and fear; and these susceptibilities are neither annihilated nor blunted in regeneration. As a rule they are rendered more sensitively acute, but are moved upon and excited by widely different causes.

The same may be said of the *will*. "The term *will* is often used to express the mere faculty of volition, whereby a man determines to act, or not to act; but we use it here in a wider sense, as including this faculty of volition with all the spontaneous feelings of the soul which determine a man in the free exercise of this

volition." The regenerate man did not receive this will by regeneration—he had it before; but it was perverted, and misguided his conscience and his determinations. In regeneration the will is not only subdued and enlightened, but it inclines and points to God like the needle to the pole, and it is aided in its resolves by the teaching and influence of the indwelling Spirit of God.

4. *By regeneration the character is transformed.* We have previously shown that in regeneration there are internal evidences which demonstrate to a man's own consciousness that the change has taken place: we have now to notice that there are evidences in his character and conduct which prove to others that he is a new creature.

(1.) There is the honour and dignity to which he is exalted. Being born of God he is made a son of God, and if a son, then an heir! How beautifully this dignified state contrasts with his former degraded one. *Then* he was in subjection to his carnal propensities and fleshly appetites, and when he would have done good evil was present with him; for there was a law in his members warring against the law of the Spirit, and he was a wretched and miserable man, bearing about with him the loathsome body of sin and death. But *now* being made a son, he is delivered from this vile body of sin and death, and being dead indeed unto sin, he cannot live any longer therein, it cannot exercise any dominion over him, for he is not under the law, but under grace. In his former state, he was the slave, and sin was the tyrant; in his present regenerated state, he is the master, and sin is subjected. He may be tempted to sin; but sin does not consist in a man's being tempted to its commission, but in his yielding to the temptation. Was not Christ tempted? Were not images of great sinfulness presented to his holy mind? And did not Satan suggest to him the most outrageous acts of wickedness? But he did not sin in being thus tempted, because he hated the sin, resisted the temptation, and retired from the field a conqueror. If, like him, the believer hates, resists, and overcomes, he will escape from the temptation sinless. In reading the lives of the holiest saints in ancient and modern times you may have been struck with the number, nature, and violence of their temptations; and in the greatness of your surprise, you may have asked, "if these men were regenerated, and if regeneration be the pure and exalted state which it is represented to be, why were they thus tempted and solicited to evil?" We answer, the presentation of these temptations to their minds does not prove the non-existence of a regenerate state; but their being enabled to successfully resist such powerful temptations proves the existence of an indwelling power which is supernatural and divine. In their unregenerate state they could not have resisted them, and must have been overcome, but being born of God, and sustained by the

power of an inward and spiritual life, they were more than conquerors. How sublime the dignity of the regenerate man to be thus delivered from the degrading practice of sin and elevated above his former self, to be made a partaker of the divine nature, and to hold communion with the Father of lights!

But there are two important facts to be observed here. *First.* This exalted state does not exclude the possibility of falling. Thousands have fallen, and others may fall. As our continuance in that state, as well as our admission thereunto, depends on our employment of the divine facilities afforded to us, there is a possibility of our becoming negligent, and thereby forfeiting our rights and interests in that state. *Second.* The fact of a person falling into sin does not prove that he was a hypocrite—that the work was not genuine—that he was deceived—that he was not regenerated. Whilst we are free to admit that many profess to be regenerated who are not, and that others are carried away by excitement and speedily bring reproach on the holy name whereby they are called, we do strongly object to these cases being adduced as proofs that every person who falls from grace is a hypocrite. We have also a most decided objection to the term "*soundly converted*," which is in such general use amongst us, as if there were two kinds of conversion, *sound* and *unsound*. The term contains within itself a libel on the Holy Spirit, and it ought to be expunged from the vocabulary of the church. A man either *is* regenerated or he is *not* regenerated; and if he is regenerated he is a new creature, a child of God. As a *child* of God he is perfect, possessing all the attributes and facilities of the future man; but as a new-born babe he is feeble, and requires suitable attention and nourishment, that he may live and attain unto the perfect stature of a man in Christ Jesus. But, alas, thousands die in their early infancy; some through injudicious nursing, others by the administration of improper food, and others of sheer starvation. And then there is a rather numerous class who get stunted in their spiritual growth, and remain in a state of childhood all their days, and are constantly troubling the household by their pettishness.

(2.) There is the Divine impress which the regenerate man receives. The apostle portrays the *un*regenerate man as earthly, sensual, and devilish; and this applies to all men in their natural state. But the regenerate man is transformed by the renewing of his mind; and whilst he "proves what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God," he receives unto himself pardon, and holiness, and heaven. Christ dwells within him; and by this mystic association of being, he is assimilated to the Divine likeness. Meekness, gentleness, goodness, and charity, are seen in his temper, words, and actions.

(3.) There is the distinguished service in which the regenerate

man is engaged. Previous to this great and divine change he was the servant of sin; all his members were employed in its service—he yielded them as instruments of iniquity unto iniquity. So thoroughly was he employed in this unholy work, that he was "free from righteousness;" he neither acknowledged its claims nor yielded to its influences. But now, being made free from sin—delivered from its power and dominion—he has become the servant of God, and has his fruit unto holiness. He is now as fully occupied in the work of holiness as he previously was in the work of iniquity; he is "free from sin," and all his members are cheerfully and unreservedly yielded as instruments of righteousness unto holiness. He lives, and thinks, and speaks, and acts for God.

II. THE NECESSITY OF REGENERATION.

1. *The necessity of regeneration arises from the universal sinfulness of man.* Christ died to secure life and salvation for all men, because all men were spiritually dead and required salvation. This was the substance and design of Christ's own teaching, and that of his apostles, and there are no exceptions to this rule. All men are descended *from* and related *to* Adam our federal head, and as the result of his disobedience are subjected to *moral* as well as *physical* evil. The physical evils of sin are seen, felt, and acknowledged by all; no one questions the universal prevalence of pain, misery and death, because they exist everywhere and at all times. Nor are the moral evils less prevalent or less evident; the numerous and express declarations of Scripture, with the universal existence of crime from the days of Adam until now, unmistakably proclaim the apostacy and corruption of our race. How fearfully does the state of society before the flood, as described by the pen of inspiration, contrast with the elevated purity of Eden's innocency. All flesh had corrupted its way before God, and the imaginations of men's hearts were only evil, and evil continually. We are also told by the apostle Paul, "that death hath passed upon all men, because all have sinned;" hence, as all men are naturally sinful it is absolutely necessary that all men should be regenerated. The man who argues that because he is good he does not need to be regenerated, is according to his own argument too good for the saviour, and voluntarily excludes himself from the benefits of redemption, both in this world and that which is to come.

2. *Regeneration is essential to moral excellence.* Most persons who have a due regard for character and position, and who rightly estimate their domestic and social interests, cherish a desire to be virtuous, and to be associated with the good. They abhor the idea of being counted vile and unworthy of good citizenship, and of being excluded from the companionship and confidence of the wise and the holy. This was most heart-rending to the unhappy Cain; it was more than he could endure, to be driven out from the

presence of God, and the fellowship of the holy. It is painfully true that there are large numbers who are fearfully reckless of character and position, and who show their sin as Sodom, and glory in their shame; but it is also pleasing to know that there are many others who really wish to be good, and to serve their generation according to the will of God. Upon these we affectionately urge the necessity of obtaining the regeneration of their hearts; for unless they are "born again," they can neither enjoy the immunities nor perform the duties of the kingdom of God, "For the carnal mind is enmity against God, it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be; so then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God."

3. *Regeneration is essential to spiritual enjoyment.* The human heart yearns for safe and blissful rest, and its varied and ceaseless outgoings require a pure and perennial supply. But where can such repose and sustenance be found except in close union and confiding friendship with the God of all grace and consolation? But sin has separated the soul from God, and rendered it unfit for such hallowed fellowship; and before such an association can be formed by an unhappy and unholy man with the Father of his spirit and the fountain of all purity, he must be renewed in his inner man and washed in the laver of regeneration. When thus regenerated—and not till then—he becomes a son and heir of God, and is entitled to the riches and immunities of the purchased inheritance. All things are now his—pardon, holiness, peace, consolation, life and death, things present and things to come; all are his, for he is Christ's, and Christ is God's. Happy is the man who is in such a case, whose God is the Lord.

4. *Regeneration is a necessary qualification for Christian usefulness.* This applies to Christians generally, but to ourselves as Christian ministers more especially. We have already shown that regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit; and as the primary object of our important mission is "to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to the living God," we can only succeed in proportion as we are armed with *that* Spirit's might. However great our natural endowments—however extensive our literary attainments—or however eloquent our pulpit addresses, we shall fail in our momentous task unless God works in us and by us; and how can he do so unless we are purified by him, united to him, and are living in him by a vigorous and realising faith? To be "filled with the Spirit" is the great qualification! This was the secret of apostolic success; and by it Primitive Methodism achieved her early triumphs. This was the trusty sword by which William Clowes, John Oxtoby, Jeremiah Gilbert, John Smith, William G. Bellham, John Ride, and Thomas Morgan prevailed against their legion foes; and this is the sword by which we must

ı our bloodless conquests to the ends of the earth. Oh, my ıren, while we secure all the *additional weapons* we can for ıccomplishment of our holy warfare, let us not adopt any *sub-te* for this omnipotent and two-edged sword. Let us daily re- our sacred covenant, and never suffer any separation from him is our light, our life, our strength, and our salvation.

Regeneration is necessary as a meetness for eternal felicity. nen are immortal, and must eternally live in blissful fellowship the pure and the glorified or in painful association with the and the outcast. The heavenly Jerusalem, its glorious King, appy residents, its sublime employments, and its blissful pri- es, are all holy; "and there shall in no wise enter into it any ; that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or ɜth a lie." And were it possible for an unholy person to be ıtted there, he could not live in its purity, engage in its wor- or participate in its pleasures; a meetness for it is as essential title to it. We must be regenerated before we can enter en; and now is the time and this is the place for the accom- ıment of this necessary work. The church invites, the Saviour s, and the Spirit strives; yield, pray, believe!

R. PARKS.

ART. VII.—THE CONCEPT OF CREATION.

[E three primary ideas of reason are God, the soul, and the world; corresponding with their concretes, theology, psychology, cosmology. The last-named science has been prolific of the est theories and speculations. One class of philosophers :t that everything is real; another, that everything is phe- enal; whilst a third maintains that everything is both real and ıomenal. Some metaphysicians have done good service to ɔsophy in counteracting the tendency of positivism, by showing everything which the senses cognise is not a reality, but a ıomenon. For instance, Berkley's theory is undoubtedly true a confined within proper limits—that is to say, when it is used rove our inability to demonstrate the existence of the substance natter; but when it is employed to disprove the existence of ter as a distinct entity, it transgresses the limits of the con- able, and attempts something which it cannot achieve. Ontology

may be declared an impossible science. We may experience great difficulty in arriving at satisfactory data on which to erect a philosophy of the real; still we cannot be stripped of our conscious personality, or be persuaded that sensible objects are but subjective ideas. Somehow or other there exists in human nature a stubborn scepticism in reference to pure idealism, which no amount of dialectic skill is able to remove. Although unable to prove the existence of external objects, we instinctively believe in those realisms which have their corresponding ideas in the human mind namely, God, the soul, and the world. The Concept of Creation includes—

Commencement. The Bible opens with a sublime declaration "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." By some the truthfulness of this inspired statement is questioned, and by others it is denied. The question naturally suggests itself whether is mind or matter inferior? Evidently matter. If the matter be inferior to mind, presumptive evidence is afforded of the eternity of mind, and of the non-eternity of matter. If matter is inferior to mind is it not more reasonable to suppose that mind created matter, than that matter originated mind? If matter be eternal it must possess a necessary and an independent existence. But matter is made up of parts; the parts possess the same properties as the whole, so that we have a universe of finite, necessary and independent atoms, which is absurd and contrary to fact. Atoms are not independent, but related and interdependent. They are formed into organisms, and each part of which an organism is composed is related to, and dependent on other parts; and other parts are related to, and dependent on it. Without this mutual relation and dependence material organization would be impossible. If therefore the parts of matter be dependent, the whole of matter must be dependent; for the whole cannot possess qualities of which the parts are destitute, or contain more in quantity than the sum total of its parts. The law of gravitation constitutes a bond of union from which no material particle is exempt. Matter is subject to a governance over which it has no control. It yields a blind obedience to those forces which, though distinct from, continually operate upon it. It is bound by laws as with chains of adamant, which it cannot break, and from which it cannot possibly escape. Is not this dependence of matter on some higher cause fatal to its necessary and independent existence? If not, then we remark—if matter be either globular or cubical in form, then is its infinity impossible. If particles of matter are globular, interstices will exist, however closely the particles be pressed, and therefore infinite space cannot be occupied. If atoms possess the cubical form, the universe must be an infinite cube, incapable of moving or of being moved. Matter is impenetrable: two particles can-

not exist in the same place at the same time. But matter is divisible, so that a space exists between the parts when divided. Matter can be moved, and is continually moving; but if matter were infinitely extended, it would fill all space, so that motion would be utterly impossible. Matter, then, occupies but a portion of space, and is therefore limited by something outside and beyond itself. Such a finding is fatal to the infinity of the material universe either in extension or duration; for if it be finite in one mode or relation it cannot be infinite in another. A finite infinite is inconceivable. In attempting to realise in thought the manner of creation, we are rebuked by the contradictions to which such an attempt inevitably leads. Can we form any clear, intelligible notion of the commencement of time? Can we project ourselves out of time, and yet remain in time? Can we fix our thoughts upon a point of time before time began to be? We may talk about traversing the cycles of the past, and standing in the imaginary void to witness the birthday of creation, and to listen to its natal song; but is this not imagination rather than sober thought? The fact of creation we have, but the manner of its accomplishment is not given us to know.

An efficient cause. So far as we are acquainted, everywhere, in everything, and at every moment, nature operates according to established laws. That matter could not give to itself rules of action appears evident, otherwise each material particle would possess inherent volition and intelligence. Matter is one thing, and the conditions under which it exists is quite another. The forces by which matter is governed, and the laws by which those potentialities are regulated, are vastly superior to matter, inasmuch as that which governs is greater than that which is governed. Matter could not give to itself something which it does not possess, for the effect cannot contain more than the cause. A law implies a lawgiver; design supposes volition and intelligence. Thus we may arrive at the doctrine of a free, powerful, intelligent Creator, whom we call God. "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth." "Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves."

Let us look a little further into this subject, and try to apprehend it more clearly. A cause implies an effect. The cause exists only so far as it has an effect; the effect exists only so long as it possesses a cause. Has an effect been co-existent with the First Cause? If so, does it not seem to indicate the eternity of some finite substance? If not, then we have a cause without an effect. Or can we remove the difficulty by supposing the Deity to have existed in a state of repose, and only to have become the Efficient Cause of all things in time? His attributes may have slumbered, but attributes in quiescence are to us no attributes

whatever. An unrealized potentiality is to us no potentiality at all; for we can only be certified of the existence of power by its effects. Is not activity more perfect than inactivity? If the Infinite has been for ever active what were the results of his activity? If inactive can the Infinite Absolute acquire something which it did not formerly possess, and thus become more perfect? Here we must depend on the teachings of revelation, and in its authoritative enunciations seek repose and safety from disturbing and anxious speculation.

Increase of existence. Our notion of creation is the calling of something into existence which formerly did not exist. If the material universe has been called into being by God, then it could not have previously existed; otherwise it could not be creation proper, but mere change. It seems to be a natural sentiment that creation has augmented the sum of existence. We exist. Our consciousness assures us that we have not always existed. My parents are not myself, neither am I my parents. The offspring is produced by the parents; yet the parents are not sensible of any privation, whilst the offspring is conscious of a separate, independent existence. Some philosophers maintain that existence is not susceptible of increase or decrease. Creation in this sense is not creation, but modification. If existence cannot be increased by creation, then some substance must have pre-existed, out of which the universe was fabricated. If that substance was matter, are we not landed into atheism?—if spirit, are we not driven into an idealistic pantheism? The doctrine that the totality of being cannot be increased or diminished, whilst avoiding some difficulties, plunges us into others equally absurd. It tends to destroy our personality; to invest us with pre-existence of which we are not, and cannot be conscious; and blends into one the infinite and finite, the noumenal and the phenominal, cause and effect. The theory of creation out of nothing is equally absurd; for out of nothing, nothing can arise. Such a thing cannot be conceived. Every concept must have definite contents; but nothing is a void. It violates the law of identity, and is therefore incapable of becoming an object of thought. The hypothesis that creation has been effected by God evolving it out of himself seems just as contradictory. Can B be taken from A and yet A remain? If B *can* be taken from A and yet A remain, then A and B unitedly constitute the universe of existence, consequently the sum total of being is composed of two parts, which is fatal to the infinity of God. If B *cannot* be taken from A without A suffering diminution, then also is its infinity annihilated: for whatever is susceptible of privation cannot be infinite. In attempting to reduce this subject to the forms of reason, we are entangled in the meshes of uncertainty and contradiction. We have the mystery, but human reason can-

fathom it. The problem exists, but the key to its solution is ting. In order to comprehend this and other cognate subjects limits of our thoughts would have to be illimitably extended. e likewise we must walk by faith.

Distinction. Creation regarded as an effect must be distinct from ause. The finite though related to the infinite cannot be one with We may ask, how can the finite and the infinite co-exist? How the relative and the absolute limit each other? Are not relation limitation fatal to the existence of the absolute as conceived by us? w can God be in the world, and yet not of it? These and similar stions puzzle the mind, and in attempting their solution men have cluded that God is all, and all is God. Surely creation cannot be a de of the divine existence! if so, the finite is absorbed in the all, d pantheism is the result. Scientists inform us that the properties things are the only objects which the senses cognise. But do not alities necessarily suggest a substratum in which they inhere? piece of stone is not extension, figure, weight, colour inertia; is not one nor all of these combined. What then is it? We nnot tell. The science of being may be vetoed as an impossible ence; nevertheless phenomenology implies ontology. If there no reality can there be appearance? Does not the shadow ppose the substance? We cannot prove the real, neither can we prove it. Metaphysicians may tell us that our intuitions, ether derived from external objects or from modes of thought, only phenomenal; still we are bound to posit an ego as well as non-ego. Self and not-self constitute the poles of thought. ose mental states which are continually occuring in the mind necessarily distinct from the continuous, percipient self. ought implies a thinker; feeling, a sentient being; volition, a luntary agent. My thoughts, and feelings, and volitions form variable element, whilst the conscious personality, the in-idual I, still remains. Each human consciousness testifies to tinction and limitation, and is therefore finite. We cannot both the creator and the thing created, the effect whose cause s within itself.

Dependence. Creation must depend on the Creator, just as an ect depends on its cause. Without a cause there would be no ect, and wanting a Creator there would be no creation. An ect may cease to depend on its cause. The power which gave it th may cease to operate in that particular direction, and that ich was once an effect may become a cause to some other ect. Nature is but a vast congery of effect, whose primary d efficient cause is God. The universe is not only indebted him for its existence, but it is equally dependent on him for its ntinuance. He upholdeth all things by the word of his power. is strength is the immoveable buttress against which creation

leans. His all-pervading presence forms the everlasting pillars on which the temple of nature rests. On the bosom of the infinite the finite reposes with perfect security and ease. In him we live, and move, and have our being. But what constitutes the bond of union between spirit and matter, or how the Infinite Unity can dwell in a finite plurality, we have no means of ascertaining. A great gulf exists, but how to span it we know not. The speculative philosophy may attempt the construction of a bridge, but it will be too insecure for solid thought to tread. "The God of humanity is no more separated from the world than he is concentrated in it. A God without a world is for man as if he were not God; and a world without a God is an incomprehensible enigma to his thought, and an overwhelming weight upon his heart."

Final cause. God is the end as well as the beginning of all things. By him and for him all things consist. For his glory they are and were created. The dynamic and design arguments are fittingly employed to illustrate and prove the wisdom, power, and goodness of God. Creation is a vast system of contrivances, which have for their ultimate end the glory of God in the promotion of creature good. Here we are led to inquire, has the fulness of the Deity been expressed in creation? If so, can the finite contain the complement of the infinite? If not, is there an unbounded plenitude of excellence in the Godhead which remains undeveloped? Or can we solve the difficulty by stating that the Deity is both subject and object to himself? Creation is but limited, consequently the platform is too narrow on which the glory of the Unlimited may be adequately displayed. It would require an infinite creation to manifest the full-orbed splendour of an infinite creator, which is impossible. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." The things which are seen are but the limnings of God's eternal glory. "Lo, these are a portion of his ways; but how little a portion is heard of him? but the thunder of his power who can understand?"

THOMAS PARSONS.

ART. VIII.—WORDSWORTH'S POETRY.

FORE we give ourselves to the unreserved admiration of his higher poems, we would venture the remark, and that in no t of presumptuous criticism, but as the suggestion forced upon y each perusal of Wordsworth's volumes, that, high as the poet's as must rank in respect of general power, it yet wanted iptitude, rapidity, and force in its mode of action. His mind ed slowly, patiently, thoughtfully; but it must *begin* with present, or with the familiarly remembered. It would seem to have had the power, suddenly and at the first effort, of porting itself into the midst of scenes of rapid action, change, consequence. His beginnings must date from the calm, and present, and familiar. Imagine him to select for his theme azzar's feast and the light traced warning on the wall; would nforce his mind with some such suddenness and completeness the scene as to present to us, without preface or circumlocu- this picture, which is simple, severely brief, and naked in utline, like some etchings we have seen of *Faust* and of *beth*, while yet the representation is a perfect whole, and every ted circumstance significant and awful?

'The king was on his throne,
The satraps thronged the hall;
A thousand bright lamps shone
On that high festival.
A thousand cups of gold,
In Judah deemed divine—
Jehovah's vessels hold
The godless Heathen's wine!

In that same hour and hall,
The fingers of a hand
Came forth against the wall,
And wrote as if on sand:
The fingers of a man:—
A solitary hand
Along the letters ran,
And traced them like a wand.

'The monarch saw and shook,
And bade no more rejoice;
All bloodless waxed his look,
And tremulous his voice.

'Let men of lore appear,
'The wisest of the earth,
'And expound the words of fear,
'Which mar our royal mirth.

Chaldea's seers are good,
But here they have no skill;
And the unknown letters stood
Untold and awful still.
And Babel's men of age
Are wise and deep in lore;
But now they were not sage,
They saw and knew no more.

'A Captive in the land,
A stranger and a youth,
He heard the king's command,
He saw that writing's truth.
The lamps around were bright,
The prophecy in view;
He read it on that night,—
The morrow proved it true.

''Belshazzar's grave is made,
His kingdom passed away,
He in the balance weigh'd
Is light and worthless clay.
The shroud, his robe of state,
His canopy the stone;
The Mede is at his gate!
The Persian on his throne!"

Hebrew Melodies.

We have placed before the reader these lines of Lord Byron, as a better method of illustrating our remarks, on the slow and difficult action of Wordsworth's mind, than any we could attain by mere description. Whoever is familiar with his poetry, may judge of its prevailing character in this respect by the contrast presented in the lines we have quoted. We cannot conceive his mind rushing, as it were, upon his theme in this manner, grasping its complete scene in one vivid glance, and giving forth its picture, in lines brief, simple, but each significant as the words of warning traced on the wall! Had he set his thoughts to frame a poem on this subject he would have dated it from some far-off point, or brought Belshazzar before us, with allusion to his previous calm of thought and the slow working of his first fears. But we must forbear. It is not competent to us to presume on the paths of a mighty mind. This, however, we may venture to add, that he would have made a much longer poem of it, would have intermingled much of insignificant circumstance, which Byron's rapid

ght rejected, would have introduced perhaps some allusions of
e far-stretched reference to future or foregone times, on the
inies of Nineveh, Babylon, or Egypt; but he would not, he
d not, have fixed the awful picture of the scene, in all its
ible import, as the words of Byron have done. His description
ld have led often away from the scene; the genius of his noble
emporary places and detains us in it.

his was one of Wordsworth's peculiarities and defects, the want
apidity of thought, which conducts at once over the whole re-
ms of a theme or event, and enables the mind to perceive and
t the more important and significant, and, dismissing the
ial, however connected, to present those which alone are charged
electric power to stir the spirit. He could not—we speak it
ctantly, but with conviction—he could not do this. If he
d not commence with the commencement, and mount his way
ently upward, he could not move at all. His mind was essen-
y reflective, not imaginative, except under the action of reflec-
. His fancies came not first, but second before him, in the
n of any object. His mind was not excited uncontrollably to
lofty theme. He *studied* his poetry, instead of being dis-
ed by its inspirations. Hence, he preferred the patient elab-
on of something before him, some minutest incident, which
st no trouble to remember and fairly to conceive in all its
, to the invention of a dependent and progressive train of in-
ats, or the rapid survey of the scenes of a great action. He
d not describe a battle, neither could he write a romance or a
onate play; but he could write *imaginative meditations;* and,
ever lowly and simple the theme, he could raise and expand
nd it, in the form of beauteous and unforeseen analogies or
ions, a rainbow of mild and varied glory, such as the eye
r tires of beholding, and in whose intermingling and change-
olours we seem ever to discern some new phase of splendour.

o write poetry with him, therefore, was a work of love, but
of toil. He could invent scenes of action, or represent anew
e recorded, but slowly, perhaps not at all; but then he was
in thoughts awakened gradually in the meditation on any
ct of life or nature, and the more humble and hopeless the
ne, often the more prosperous and splendid the adventure of
poet. He could do little with Waterloo; but he could do
lers with Peter Bell. He could not plan a rapid series of
ts in a romance, but he could unfold sublime reaches of thought
iscourse with the Pedlar; and then inspiration flows in upon
as in presence of the unveiled mystery of the universe. He
d not touch the greater themes of Milton—not his *Paradise*
, not his *Paradise Regained*, not even his *Comus* or *Samson*

Agonistes; but he could rival his sonnets, and make a very near approach to his *Lycidas.*

If we have dwelt thus long on the defective side of Wordsworth's genius, it has not been in a spirit of disparagement, but with the simple design of marking the peculiarities which distinguish it. It has been our wish to enable the reader to conceive, with some distinctness of view, what it is he is to look for in the pages of Wordsworth, and what it is he must not expect to find there. This can only be accomplished by the patient analysis of criticism, in remarking on general and pervading qualities of sentiment and diction, and, further, in touching with something even of exaggerated colouring on peculiarities, lauded by some of the admirers of this poet as merits, censured by others as blemishes. To have mastered the general system and discriminating properties of an author's compositions, is to have made a grand step towards the more perfect intelligence of each part. Every separate piece is read with more interest, if we have a clear insight into its elements and structure. But, to gain such insight, we must remark what elements are present, and what are not present in it; and of the elements apparent, what is the order, and what the proportion of each. To remark, however, on what qualities are absent, if these are of essential value, will be to animadvert on defects. At the same time, the qualities which a composition actually contains may be of rare worth and beauty, and full justice should be done to these by an equally ample exhibition.

It is to be remembered, that Wordsworth did not ask indulgence for the meaner themes and details of his poetry as sportive or occasional caprices of his muse; but professed that he selected them by design, and somewhat fiercely, for so mild a spirit, defends their composition as more true emanations of poetry than many of those productions of other poets which aim at higher dignity in subject and in representation. Whether, by the most common of all illusions, and one which is nearly inevitable to all minds, he was not led induly to magnify the value of efforts which most naturally drew on the action of his own mind, and deemed that infallibly excellent on which he had expended so much patient thought; and whether his poetical creed was not formed unconsciously to correspond with his psychological tendencies, instead of being primarily the law which should control those tendencies, it is for us, rather respectfully to suggest, than in any confidence to determine. It is certainly a circumstance as astonishing as any known in literature, that he should defend the very meanest points in every single composition, not as lapses, but as intentional and meditated parts, essential to the perfection of the whole!

It is with no common degree of interest that we now advance to the consideration of the brighter qualities of his writings; in which

our task is far easier, as we have only to point attention to passages which nearly all have agreed to admire. We will begin our quotations with one which, it is true, the chief of his earlier critics selected as a sample of what he considered as the chaff in these compositions. But the majority of readers have not affirmed this verdict. The little piece we are about to quote is become familiar as a fragment of an oracle, full of deep meaning. It is a prelude of simple, yet mystic song, which, the oftener heard, reveals more and more of thought and beauty. It is placed by the Poet the very first in the revised collection of his works, and placed there with design, to challenge the reader's judgment at the outset on the prevailing character of the whole; and Wordsworth, we think, would have added, to test the reader's capacity for divining the import and scope of all his poems. It has the intermixture of the mean and the meditative; of childlike thought and of beautiful original inference, which opens, in two or three words, an unfathomable theme, awakening to further thought. This intermixture misled the critic. It made him right, and also wrong, in his sentence. He fixed on the simpler element, and held it forth to scorn. Others have fixed on the deeper suggested thought, and vindicated the title of the whole to admiration. Some of our readers may not, perchance, deem the poems we shall quote worthy of such extended preface, or may even dissent in their estimate of its merits. We have given these remarks, however, as preliminary illustration of a whole class, and we confidently reckon on the assent of nearly all in our appreciation of these well-known lines:—

'My heart leaps up when I behold
A rainbow in the sky:
So was it when my life began;
So is it now I am a man;
So be it when I shall grow old,
Or let me die!
The Child is father of the man;
And I could wish my days to be
Bound each to each by natural piety.'

This is one of the poems referring to the period of childhood, and is precisely one of those which may be recited lightly and without impression, or even with ridicule; yet whoever has stored it in his memory, whoever allows its allusions to sink in his mind, will find that it supplies themes of inexhaustible meditations, and of a kind to charm the mind to its own wonderings. It is based on the psychological fact constantly felt, though not perhaps consciously adverted to, namely, the endurance of the simple forms of emotion from early childhood to calm old age. In after life the spectacle of nature awakens oftentimes those impressions of its thrilling wonders which were felt in childhood. Is it not so? or

have our sensibilities become extinct or altered? Is it not, further, a happiness to feel we are the same in this respect as in childhood? Our hearts are not all grown old! Our being is the same; it is mysteriously one, yet different; it is, in years, the unfolding of germs of thought which budded in infancy. We part not with our first being, but carry forward its consciousness into the future. Our existence is not an instant's transient thought, but a memory, sunlit with undecaying brightness. We love the past; we love to revisit the early, fresh impressions of that dawning time. But *these* are ever renewed in the presence of those aspects of nature which first awakened them. Our knowledge is progressive; our principles gain maturity; but the sensibilities of the heart remain; or it were a calamity if they did not, and we might at the thought exclaim with the poet, 'or let me die!' We have an affection for the first flowers we admired in our father's garden, and for that first garden where we raised the mimic structures of our fancy. And then the aspect of the evening sky, or the marvel of the coloured rainbow reposing on the sky as the thunderstorm retreated! Is this spectacle as seen now, other than as seen in childhood? Is there a rapture purer than to revive that wonder in all its force and all its associations? That delight comes over us yet again, as often as we yield ourselves to the pensive gaze of nature.

> 'My heart leaps up when I behold
> A rainbow in the sky.

This *identity of moral happiness* in converse with the beautiful, is the poet's real theme, though unannounced. It is pursued as surviving the first stages of life; it is advanced till he reaches the unthought of, yet beautiful suggestions, that its after stages are modified by the influences of the past, and the mature intelligence of the man based upon the intuitions of the child—'the child is father of the man.' The past gives form to the present; and the earliest feelings have in them that which claims our reverence, as the source of the best in the consciousness that is, and that will be! Life's experience is linked in hallowed successions. An old age of fresh affections, like childhood's love, and of fresh emotions, like childhood's wonder—and such all of us have surely seen—is one of beauty as well as of dignity.

> 'So be it when I shall grow old;
> And I could wish my days to be
> Bound each to each by natural piety.'

We profess not to have given the full import of this little poem; but we have attempted to give something of its spirit and suggestions; and we put it to every reader, whether there is error in

deeming it fruitful of such, whether it is not a fact that these plain, pregnant lines do convey in their lowly forms of language thus much, and even far more than we have have had power to elicit. This, at least, is our feeling, and we have dwelt thus fully on this little poem in order to illustrate what we deem the characteristic effect of Wordsworth's lines, their power to awaken thought in the reader almost without end.

This, then, is the effect of the better part of Wordsworth's poetry, beyond that of any modern poetry whatever, that its words are key-notes of meaning, which set in action trains of thought and emotion in the reader's mind, and affect it with a sort of incantation. Other poets in their general manner tell all; they picture all; and the whole task is terminated for us. When Scott has described the combat of Roderick with Fitzjames, or made old Allan sing the death-dirge over the former in prison, nothing further is suggested or felt. Thus, also, to recur to ancient examples, when Homer has described the first of his battle-arrays, when the ground vibrates under the tramp of the assembling hosts, he has pretty nearly told us all he means. This is not the manner of the oldest tragic poet of Greece, Æschylus. His reserve, his silence, after some single allusion, is often terrific. How awful the suspense created by the replies of Cassandra, to the Chorus in the *Agememnon*! The great poet of the Middle Ages again, Dante, often reveals all he knows, but at other times leaves much more to be implied than he relates. Shakespeare is rich in all modes of effect, sometimes by the breadth and minuteness of his picture, and sometimes, as in *Macbeth*, by hints with meanings reserved, and by mystery. Milton gives complete description and narrative, but his single words and allusions are so curiously selected from the riches of ancient literature, as well as of modern science and learning, that his lines, besides giving forth their direct meanings, recall, by incidental and secondary reference, endless associations from the whole circle of knowledge. These two species of instrumentality, that of the full representation, and that of the reserved and allusive, have respectively their high effect and value, to be determined in each case by the character of the subject. If a battle is to be represented, it will not do to hint at it; it must have detail, sequence, and vicissitude. In like manner the scenes of nature, to be effectively set before us, require not only distinctness of outline, but the manifold touches which give minuter objects clearness and relief. In allusion to the interior world of mind, briefer indications will often suffice. The poet's reference points to workings of thought already familiar to our consciousness, and which perhaps no words could avail to fully depict, but which yet one word may make us comprehend as by inspiration. The first tendency of the poetic impulse is objective; it is to represent, as in

Homer and Milton, the outward, vividly and fully. If this force of genius be wanting, it is compensated in a high degree by the reflective; by the power which glances to the relations of objects rather than their picture, and, instead of exhibiting a rapid and spirited succession of many actions and events, delights rather in meditating the import of a few; and produces its best and most impressive effect by touching on associated allusions, in other words, on some interesting relation of the event or circumstance given, to some other in the background which is barely hinted at. We will not say that this meditative element in Wordsworth, combined as it is with the power of depicting the present and momentary phenomena of nature, is an overbalance to the power of Scott in vivid description, or to the still greater force of Byron, which in him is combined with the charm of reserve and suggestion: but unquestionably it is such, as united to other qualities, to place him in the same rank with these poets, while it prepares for him, perhaps, a more enduring regard, if not with the many, with the reflective reader in every age. The effect of Scott's poetry is, after repeated perusals, enfeebled; that of Wordsworth's is not so. Lord Byron's poems will bear more frequent reading, especially his *Childe Harold* and his *Manfred*. But in the end, by an iterated reading, their full conception seems mastered and to have become familiar. If tried by this test, we venture to say that Wordsworth's will rather gain than lose, for at least a long succession of perusals; and this in consequence of the suggestive effect of his thoughts, as is sufficiently palpable, we think, in the little poem we have quoted. Hence his poems become in some sort a study to those who have surmounted the difficulty of their first impression, which is that of prosaic obscurity, and who have acquired a sympathy with his manner of thought. Of course, in respect of this their suggestive quality much depends on the interest inhering in the thoughts half-spoken and suggested. If these are common and mean, the awakening a remembrance of them will not forward the poet's aim; but if they are grand the while, and in harmony with the spoken strain, their effect is incalculable, like the more obscure, remote figures in the background of a sublime picture, or the distant echoes of coming thunder amid the serene glories of the setting sun. Principal objects have their prominence, but they are given so as to give token of their relation to other objects still more grand and awful.

Let us relieve the reader's attention, after tasking his patience with these imperfect distinctions, by placing before him one of those pieces of Wordsworth in which his theme is chosen on higher ground, and his manner of treatment is worthy of his theme. This example will show how nobly he could conceive thoughts on a level with the grandest exigencies of human misfortune. The

ce we allude to is entitled 'Mary Queen of Scots' Lament on
Eve of a New Year.' A few stanzas are all we can afford space

I.

'Smile of the moon!—for so I name
That silent greeting from above;
A gentle flash of light that came
From her whom drooping captives love;
Or art thou still of higher birth?
Thou that didst part the clouds of earth,
My torpor to reprove!

II.

'Bright boon of pitying Heaven!—alas!
I may not trust thy placid cheer!
Pondering that Time to-night will pass
The threshold of another year;
For years to me are sad and dull;
My very moments are too full
Of hopelessness and fear.

III.

'And yet, the soul-awakening gleam,
That struck perchance the farthest cone
Of Scotland's rocky wilds, did seem
To visit me, and me alone;
Me, unapproached by any friend,
Save those who to my sorrows lend
Tears due unto their own.

IV.

'To-night the church-tower bells will sing
Through these wide realms a festive peal;
To the new year a welcoming;
A tuneful offering for the weal
Of happy millions lulled in sleep;
While I am forced to watch and weep,
By wounds that may not heal.'

V.

'Hark! the death-note of the year
Sounded by the castle-clock!
From her sunk eyes a stagnant tear
Stole forth, unsettled by the shock;
But oft the woods renewed their green,
Ere the tired head of Scotland's queen
Reposed upon the block!'

The task would be endless to comment with the same minute-
ss on the many others of this author's poems which form the
rling and inexhaustible treasures of his volumes. And yet each
e of them deserves such comment, as it is the genuine effect of
ch to suggest such. More than any modern poetry we know, do

the highest thoughts of Wordsworth kindle trains of other thoughts in harmony with them, or rather as the unfolding of conceptions which his words more concisely utter, or by some secondary relations imply. So that the natural effect of each on the reader, is to engage his imagination in some such process as that which we have attempted. Nor let it be imagined that this is the result of obscurity in the poet's conceptions, or indefiniteness in his language. Far from it. His meaning is most perfectly expressed, in language beautifully transparent, natural in its construction, and unaffectedly true to the design of clearly conveying the thought. The stimulus to the after-processes of the imagination is furnished by the untold relations suggested between what is expressed and what is not expressed; glancings of allusion to some anterior ideas which the spoken meanings imply, or to some remote consequence they give hint of. It is obviously most difficult to make this element palpable or even very intelligible in mere statement. The illustrations we have already attempted of the simplest of all his pieces will have perhaps conveyed some part of our meaning. To the readers of John Foster it will be further intelligible if we compare some of Wordworth's poems, in this their awakening effect on the intellect and fancy, to that writer's best passages. Everything is perfectly defined in words, yet the whole teems with associations not spoken. In fact, many of the paragraphs of Foster's first Essay, if adjusted to metre, by very slight changes, would read like some of the noblest pages of Wordsworth. And in both, the quality which ministers to other thoughts, is not the obscurity which would necessitate it, but the comprehensiveness, the originality, the radiating gleams furtherward, which delightfully invite it.

With respect to the general character of Wordsworth's higher compositions, we have further to remark that, as they thus awaken thought, so, as must necessarily have been the fact in that case, they are the *result* of deep and patient thinking. They are adorned with fancy. Allusions pleasing, or tender, or sublime, are interwoven throughout. Imagination, not perhaps in its highest force, yet with much of creative effect, gives form to many, or we may say to each, of his pieces as a perfect whole. But, independent of these creative processes, they have a basis of deep thought, which gives them sequence and significance as poems. They all embody, and we speak of them with scarcely an exception, some important moral truth, either original in itself, or in the relation it occupies in the poem. Or, if the sentiment be in itself familiar, it is invested with new beauty by its connexion with outward analogies, or by the unthought of suddeness, yet not inappropriateness of its introduction. This *spirit of thought*, this intellectual element, this intense philosophic action of the mind, in the comprehensive, natural presentation of the moral truth, is

the fundamental excellence of his writings. This is their conservative life. It is this which consecrates and guards his poetry, and gives it an attraction even beyond the effect of its proper imaginative investiture as poetry. Hence his poetry might be turned into prose arrangement, and it would read, still, much of it as poetry, and all of it as profound, original, and beautiful prose. In this respect his poems present compositions which, in natural and unforced development of striking conceptions, would rank, allowing for their brevity, with the most beautiful of the essays of our British moralists. Their aim is always lofty; their element generally some truth interesting at once to the imagination and the heart. And the exhibition of such truth is not in the form of some avowed counsel, or maxim, or moral. Neither does it rise as an intention aforethought in the poet's mind. In its relation to the poem, it is subordinate and all but hidden. In its suggestion it is fortuitous and unforeseen. Some trivial incident, the silence of some dell near the Lakes, the glory of some mountain summit, is all that is at first present to the poet's imagination. The moral associations which are intermingled, of deep feeling, of lofty hope, of sympathy with the happiness of others, or of awe in the contemplation of Divine power,—these flow in unsought, and lend their higher grace and sanctity to the whole design.

Further, not only have the chief of Wordsworth's poems the interest of moral truth blended with the play of fancy, but the presentation of the whole succession of thoughts in each is at once natural and philosophical, even when most incidentally introduced. His poems have the wisdom and depth of philosophy without the forms. They exhibit every thought in a relation the most simple and natural. The successions of thought are not those of reasoning, but always those of reason; by which we mean, that they are those which are in accordance with the natural workings of the human mind. Those of analogy, or those of contrast, or those of time or place; those of consequence from a cause, or inference from a foregone fact; whichever of these be the relation involved in the transition, the moment it is understood, it is felt to be, however new or profound in the discovery, perfectly natural in its sequence. It is not a torturing of ingenuity that is given, as in Cowley and Donne, and the rest of the metaphysical poets; it is not the caprice of an unregulated fancy, or a struggle to invent something startling; but his thoughts are the inspirations of Philosophy herself, sung to the lyre.

We must add that their form of statement, the language employed, and the order of the words, are wholly free from artifice. As we have stated, his poems can, with slightest changes, be rendered into the form of prose; with very little

deviation from their measure, they can be read as prose; so obvious and familiar is the order pursued, and so natural is the diction employed. Nothing is expressed, for being in a line of poetry, in language different from what a philosophical mind like Wordsworth's would use in prose. There is no peculiarity of diction, there is no inversion of structure, there is no torture of the natural sentiment. This was in conformity with his poetical theory, which demanded poetry, not in the form of utterance, but in the quality of the thought uttered. Hence he rejected any attempt to give his conceptions an apparent newness or dignity by their embodiment in unusual, or lofty, or so-called grand diction, or in words supposed peculiar to poetry. He rejected poetic diction as such. He employs the language of use, whether in describing familiar incident, or the recital of intelligent colloquy, or the exposition of philosophical reflection. If it be asked whence, then, did he fetch the poetic element? the reply is, not in dress or artifice of expression, but in the associations of the imagination, and in the grandeur of the thoughts themselves, expressed as prose would express them. Let it be imagined that, independently of any glare of expression, there is to be given in the current language of cultivated intelligence, and in the simple order of prose, the statement of some beautiful analogy, some startling yet not quaint contrast, some grand conception of danger or of vicissitude, or of space or of time; it is conceivable that these forms of thought can be effectively announced without verse, without rhyme, without any modulation of accents, and without deviation from the simplest arrangement of words employed in prose. The Scriptures are full of such poetry divested of metre. This is not saying that metre adds not to its effect. It does so unquestionably. Striking as are the examples of sublime thought which the Psalms, and portions of the prophetic writings are full of, it cannot be doubted that their effect was much more deep and perfect on the mind of a Hebrew, who heard and sung them in their original forms of metre. We receive them through the medium of translation, and in the resolved and extenuated statement of their import; but even this altered form has not extinguished their flame, has not obscured their light. They are poetry still, and that the most sublime that all literature can show.

British Quarterly Review.

THE

CHRISTIAN AMBASSADOR

ART. I.—DR. CAREY.

History of Missions. By Rev. W. BROWN, M.D. London: Thomas Baker. 2 vols.

Life and Times of Carey, Marshman, and Ward. By J. C. MARSHMAN. 2 vols. London: Longman & Co.

Memoir of W. Carey, D.D. By Rev. EUSTACE CAREY.

IN the first of these enumerated works Dr. Brown, a son of the venerable John Brown, of Hadington, has supplied a lack in Christian literature. To write the history of Protestant missionary enterprise was certainly an ambitious, yet highly laudable undertaking. We wish we could employ laudatory terms in speaking of the execution of this work. We admire his industry in collecting materials, and his manifest impartiality in using them; also his truly catholic sympathies and spirit. These volumes are full of deeply interesting facts, and all who are anxious for the progress of Christian truth, will find here narration to gladden their hearts. Yet it is not a history in any high and proper sense. It is a chronicle of events, without the fusing and transmuting power of genius to give life, vividness, and homogenity to the work. With such a grand theme, such romantic events, such heroic, self-sacrificing, and noble characters, the soul of the true historian would have been fired, and a story of unrivalled interest would have been produced. We hope yet to see this work adequately done.

In the second enumerated work, a son of one of the "famous three of Serampore" has written a successful defence of the fathers of modern missions, Carey, Marshman, and Ward. Mr. Marshman is a man of culture, and a writer of considerable celebrity. Great as the interest of this work is, and great as is its ability, it is manifestly a vindication of his father's memory in connection with

the unhappy disputes that raged for many years between the Serampore missionaries and the Baptist missionary authorities.

The life of Dr. Carey is the third work in our list. It is written by his nephew, himself a missionary in India, and one of the principal disputants in the above mentioned controversy. His fame for eloquence and grasp of mind are well sustained in this work. He had a subject worthy his ability. In the missionary enterprise none have been more eminent than Dr. W. Carey. His character and labours were more wonderful than those of Williams, Moffatt, or Morrison. Not that his life abounded with the incident and adventure of theirs; but rising as he did from a condition of poverty, and manfully overcoming the most formidable obstacles, and attaining a position of commanding eminence in the church, make his life one of the most extraordinary works of the kind we have ever read. We think a better work than this, one exhibiting the true art of the biographer, should have been produced. But we will not waste our time in useless complaints, but thankfully take what we have and use it.

There is a paucity of information respecting Carey's early life. The place of his birth was Paulersbury, an obscure village in Northamptonshire. For generations his ancestors had sustained the offices of parish clerk and village schoolmaster. He was therefore advantageously conditioned for getting such education as was considered good in a country village in that day. He was born August 11th, 1761. In his case the child was so far father of the man, that he manifested great facility in mastering hard lessons and great power of mental application. When only six years of age he was able to work out in his mind perplexing arithmetical questions; so intent was he on acquiring knowledge that he habitually sat up far into the night pursuing his studies. Like many youths he eagerly devoured all the books of travel and adventure he could get. His life-long preference for natural history, botany, and other branches of science developed itself early. When a mere child, if he saw a rare plant growing in hedgerows, he would add it to his stock in his garden. His room was crowded with insects which he collected to mark their characteristics and developments. His firmness and perseverance were often noticed. He was also expert in drawing sketches of plants or insects. The village youths hailed him as their companion and leader in their sports. These sports were often rough and foolish. He is spoken of as being boorish and clownish in his manners, and rustic in his appearance.

His eminence and success as a linguist was foreshadowed by the fact that when only twelve years old he obtained a copy of Dyche's Latin Vocabulary, and committed it to memory, and carefully studied the brief sketch of a grammar prefixed to it. His extremely indigent circumstances gave little scope for the pursuit

of learning; he was early required to work for the bread he ate. He was afflicted too, very sorely, with a scorbutic disorder, which scarcely allowed him to walk out in sunlight without suffering acute pain. In after life his constitution threw off this dreadful disorder, but it unfitted him in his youth for any open air occupation, so at the age of fourteen he was apprenticed to one, Clarke Nichols, a shoemaker, in the neighbouring village of Hackleton. His ardent desire for mental improvement was not quenched by unfavourable circumstances. He was never the sort of man to ask if circumstances were in his favour, and if they were not to succumb. It was quite a common thing for him to struggle against the tide of circumstances, and to turn it in his favour; so that even here, at the shoemaker's stall, he made improvement and progress. There happened to be a commentary on the New Testament in the house, containing many Greek words, and though entirely ignorant of Greek he made rude sketches of the characters and began to seek for means of knowing what they were. After many fruitless inquiries he found a weaver in Paulersbury who had been bred for the medical profession, but by his drunken habits had been compelled to earn a scanty living by manual labour. From this drunken weaver he learned the words that he had sketched. This was opening a new field, in which he found pleasant and plentiful toil for many years.

After two years' residence with Nichols, he was turned adrift upon the world, owing to the death of his master. He made an engagement with a Mr. Old, in the same craft, who is spoken of as "a worthy and respectable man." The godly and learned Thomas Scott, the author of the "Commentary," was wont to pay pastoral visits to this house. On one occasion Mr. Old appeared with his new apprentice in their working aprons. Young Carey was deeply interested in the address delivered, and when questions were invited this young country apprentice asked several with such modesty and pertinency as drew a warm commendation from the minister. He sought further acquaintance with the lad, and was pleased to find that his mind had strong scholastic leanings. A little while after, when passing the house with a friend, he, pointing to the tumble-down portion where Carey worked and studied, said, "that's William Carey's college." History will ever preserve the name of the distinguished graduate turned out of this humble college.

As became the descendant of several parish clerks, Carey was reared, to use a current phrase, a strict churchman, read only "church books," and cordially hated all dissent. Through the piety and conversation of a fellow apprentice he became the subject of deep religious convictions. His life had not been openly immoral, but he had been an utter stranger to the inward spiritual

life of Christianity. He now set himself sedulously to search the Scriptures; he also attended church three times of a Sunday, and was induced to frequent prayer meetings in a dissenting chapel. By these means he obtained the vital change which brought to his spirit the liberty and peace of the sons of God. He found Mr. Scott's ministry to be productive of spiritual edification and stimulus. The earnest perusal of Robert Hall's (the elder Hall) "Help to Zion's Travellers," made him feel the ground of his faith firm and sure. Of course his ecclesiastical straitness relaxed now, and he frequented the services of the dissenters, where he found much that was congenial to his new life. He ultimately became a member of the little Independant church in Hackleton. It was the custom of the members to hold conferences for the discussion of subjects pertaining to their Christian welfare, and Carey was called to speak upon a given subject on one of these occasions; this was his first attempt at public speaking. He was some time after this prevailed upon to go to Earls Barton, a neighbouring village, to conduct religious services there, as the spiritual destitution of the place was well known. For three years and a half he preached every Lord's-day to this village congregation. It was in the course of these juvenile ministerial exercises that he changed his opinion on the subject of baptism, and was immersed by Dr. Ryland, his future coadjutor in the cause of Christian missions. The Doctor speaking of the event says, "On the 5th of October, 1783, I baptised a poor journeyman shoemaker, in the river Nen," little thinking that the poor journeyman was destined to make his name known to the ends of the earth, and to the end of time.

Carey commenced his regular work of the ministry in connection with a newly formed church at Barton, under the auspices of the Rev. J. Sutcliff, of Olney. His patron and friend had placed a Latin grammar into his hand, which he studied to good purpose, laying the foundation for an extensive knowledge of the great language of the West. He also prosecuted his Hebrew and Greek studies, and entered upon a systematic course of mental culture. He commenced collecting his library, which ultimately became one of great value. But he found it impossible to live upon the miserable stipend he got from the church, and was driven to unite trade with his ministerial vocation. Mr. Old, his former master, dying, he took his stock and business, and what was of far greater consequence, as we shall see, married his sister, when he was only twenty years of age. That this marriage was imprudent and premature he soon felt, and felt it for many years afterwards. He had no income to warrant the step, and besides his wife was very illiterate and utterly destitute of sympathy with him in his intellectual pursuits and in the great work of his life. But this did

not prevent his treating her with unvarying affection and consideration. His tenderness and constant love to her make his meekness and magnanimity stand out in the noblest light.

He lived in his neat little cottage at Hackleton and developed his horticultural tastes in a large garden, which flourished more than his business. Indeed he was one of the many eminent men who do not succeed in business. His trade failing, and bad times setting in, he was driven to sell his stock and seek other means of living. He found, according to the saying, that misfortunes do not come singly, for he was prostrate with fever which hung upon him for eighteen months. When hardly recovered he was compelled to travel through the country with shoes to procure food for his family, his stipend from the Barton Church being hardly sufficient to buy him clothes. He was reduced to great distress, and to save him from absolute want his brother shared his earnings with him. He obtained the pastorate of another church at Moulton, in 1786, and attempted to increase his income by turning pedagogue. But if he was inapt in business he was tenfold more so as schoolmaster. He had no skill in governing children and could maintain no sort of discipline. The old schoolmaster, whose place he had taken, returning, his school melted away, and his hopes in this quarter were dashed to the ground. He was obliged to fall back again upon his old craft of shoemaking. And even in this art his skill was by no means excellent. Thirty years afterwards, when his name was pronounced with respect in the highest circles in England and India, when attending a brilliant levée of the Governor-General of India, Lord Hastings, he overheard a general officer inquire of one of his aides whether Dr. Carey had not been a shoemaker, when he stepped forward and exclaimed, "No, sir, only a Cobbler."

If he failed in every department of business he succeeded most admirably in his studies. He adopted that systematic apportionment of his duties and exercises, and that absolute economy of time, without which he could not have accomplished an amount of work that seems to us incredible. He formed an intimacy with the venerable Robert Hall, of Arnsby; he also improved his acquaintance with Dr. Ryland, but the most important friendship he formed was with the noble-minded Andrew Fuller, the Baptist minister at Kettering.

It was while perusing Cooke's Voyages round the World, and explaining geography to the boys in his school at Moulton, that he became impressed with the spiritual degradation of the heathen world, and formed the truly apostolic purpose of carrying to them the Gospel of the blessed God. The more he pondered, the more the subject filled his mind, till it became the one absorbing idea of his life. Whether travelling to vend his goods or working at home, this sublime philanthropy possessed his mind, he could

hardly speak of anything else. He pasted several pieces of paper together and constructed a rude map, writing upon it all the particulars he could glean of the several parts of the world as then known, as to the population, religions, and characteristics of the countries. While at work making or mending shoes, he would raise his eyes from lapstone or last to this map, and muse upon the condition of the people, and the means of sending them the news of God's mercy through his Son. It was to this fact that Wilberforce alluded in his very eloquent speech in the House of Commons, when, pleading for the free access of the missionaries into India, he said, "A sublimer thought cannot be conceived than when a poor cobbler formed the resolution to give to the millions of Hindoos the Bible in their own language." Carey's co-religionists received his proposals at first either with ridicule or opposition. When at a young minister's meeting, presided over by old Mr. Ryland, Carey proposed as a thesis of discussion, "The duty of Christians to spread the Gospel among the heathen," the old divine sprang to his feet, his face covered with a dark frown, and thundered out, "young man, sit down; when God pleases to convert the heathen he will do so without your aid or mine." Even good Andrew Fuller was incredulous at first, and said, "If the Lord should make windows in heaven, might such a thing be." But our young enthusiast was not to be daunted. He wrote a pamphlet expounding his views, but had not the means of publishing it till the same friend provided the funds for him. This was his first essay in speaking through the press. But while compiling this pamphlet his family were bordering on starvation, they were for a long time strangers to animal food. This pamphlet produced some sensation and materially helped forward the cause so near his heart. He got a call from a church in Leicester, which greatly improved his circumstances. Here he obtained access to several good libraries, and was much quickened by the society of some eminent men, with whose friendship he was favoured. He still persisted in urging the formation of a society to carry out his missionary scheme, but was doomed time after time to disappointment. Ultimately at the Association of Baptist ministers held at Nottingham, in 1792, Carey was appointed to deliver the Association Sermon. He then preached a sermon that has become memorable, and was the foundation sermon of the Baptist Missionary Society. His text was Isa. liv. 2, 3. "Enlarge the place of thy tent," &c. He announced and amplified these two great principles: I. Expect great things from God; II. Attempt great things for God. Those who heard the sermon spoke of it as being very animated and eloquent. The long gathering and pent up forces of his soul were poured out in breathing thoughts and burning words. Before the breaking up of this yearly meeting, he

was delighted to see this minute recorded: "That a plan be prepared against the next minister's meeting at Kettering for the establishment of a society for the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen." The plan was prepared and submitted to the meeting in the following October. The discussion was long and interesting; the whole subject was canvassed: our shoemaker-pastor was there, and manfully and ably met all objections, till eventually the first Missionary Society was founded, and an executive committee was constituted, consisting of men whose names we will transcribe as the first workers in the cause of modern missions:—Andrew Fuller, John Ryland, John Sutcliff, Reynold Hogg, and William Carey. Fuller was nominated secretary, and Mr. Hogg treasurer. The first collection was made upon the spot, and amounted to £13 2s. 6d., the first fruits of millions laid on the altar of the missionary cause.

Carey offered to embark for any country his brethren judged best to name. For a long time the new society was treated as utopian, visionary, and ill-advised, and its originators were spoken of as semi-maniacs. This however did not move them, for they were all shrewd, matter-of-fact sort of men, and devoted to God and the cause of humanity. They did not decide at once upon any sphere of operations, but went on creating and guiding public sentiment and collecting funds. After three years they decided upon India. This decision was arrived at through a letter from a Mr. Thomas, who had for some years resided in Bengal, and who had made some attempts at propagating Christianity in India. He was in England at this time collecting money to extend his operations. His representations settled these Kettering philanthropists to commence their work in Bengal.

India had been visited by Christian missionaries from 1705, when the King of Denmark sent out Ziegenbalg and another to the Danish settlement of Tranquebar, on the Coromandel coast. Then came Kiermander, a most excellent, devoted, and useful man, but who was ignorant of the language of the people. The Rev. David Brown, one of the Company's chaplains, laboured as a missionary with some success. But still no systematic operations were undertaken till now. The moral condition of India, both English and native, was most degraded. The English residents, in numbers of cases, had become orientalised. The only visible indication of any religion was the hoisting of the flag on Sundays. Horse races were run on the Sundays, and systematic gambling also occupied the sacred hours. The young civilian was told that one of his first duties was to "stock a zenana." The degrading idolatry of the natives was complacently regarded, and was said to be equally acceptable to God as Christian worship. The facts warrant the remark of Mr. Marshman in the history before

us, that "England had subdued Bengal, and Bengal had subdued the morals of its conquerors." Such was the state of things when the Baptists of England determined to send Christianity to India. Mr. Thomas was a surgeon, and had gone to India as doctor on board a Company's vessel and returned in the same capacity. He had, through the influence of that eminent man, Mr. Grant, obtained a situation in an indigo factory, had diligently studied the Bengalee, and with great zeal and much ability preached and laboured among the native population, and created a good impression. But his defects of temperament and character were such as to neutralise in a great measure any good he did. He exhibited rapid alternations of ecstacy and depression, excited zeal and cool indifference, and was thoughtless and improvident in his use of money. Yet he was well read and had a fluent and fascinating address. Of course the Baptist committee had no knowledge of the defects of Thomas's character when they took him as one of their agents. In the meeting when Thomas's offer was accepted the question was asked who should be his companion, and instantly Carey rose and offered himself and was appointed. He was thrown into great difficulty by the peremptory and persistent refusal of his wife to quit her native land. He evidently felt this severely, yet so fully had he set his heart upon going that he resolved to go alone, to keep of his salary just what he could live upon and leave the rest to his wife and four children. After he had arranged to go, and being disappointed in the ship, his wife unexpectedly yielded and consented to accompany him on condition that her sister might be one of the party.

It was no easy task to obtain money to convey so large a party; but they were committed to the enterprise and at length secured sufficient funds. But they now encountered a difficulty far more formidable. How were they to reach India? The Leadenhall Street rulers of the East had interdicted all missionary operations in their possessions, and had refused all applications for missionaries to sail in their ships. It was suggested that they might be smuggled into India, but this proposal was rejected as dishonourable and hopeless. Eventually they got a passage in the Danish ship "Cron Princessa Maria," and after five months' voyage they arrived at Calcutta. They were not opposed in landing, as they fully expected to be. Carey commenced most vigorously to learn the Bengalee. He had not been there long before he found himself involved through Thomas's unthrifty and foolish habits, and he had to remove some distance up the Hooghly, where they could live more cheaply. To make his case worse, his family were all seized with serious illness, in which one child died; and to add to his sorrows, his wife and sister-in-law united to upbraid him continually. After labouring hard all day and walking many miles he

went home wearied only to have bitter invectives poured into his ear by the two ladies. Yet he possessed his soul in patience, trusted in his God, and did his duty. He says, "I have no earthly thing to depend upon. Well, I have God; and his word is sure. Though the superstition of the Hindoos were a million times more deeply rooted, and the example of Europeans a million times worse than they are; yet if I were deserted by all, and persecuted by all, my hope fixed on that sure word will rise superior to all obstructions, and triumph over all trials,—God's cause *will* triumph." Thus he went on day after day, with Ramboso, his moonshee, through bazaars and places of public resort preaching the word of life, and at night labouring at the languages and translations. Obtaining a small sum of money, he resolved to go up the country, but he went out not knowing whither he went. He continued his journey till his stock of provisions was exhausted, when he landed about forty miles up the river Dehatta, where he met with a government official, who, though not religious, invited him to reside with him till he could make some arrangements for his future course. He proceeded to clear the jungle and erect huts. This was in the Sonderbuns, the home of the Bengal tigers and of more deadly malarious diseases. From this dangerous place he was induced to remove by representations from Thomas inviting him to go to Malda, where they were hired as overseers of indigo factories. This gave him means of subsistence and a sphere of acceptable labour. He sent instructions to England that his salary might be devoted to the printing of Bengalee Testaments or the sending out of more agents; but he wished still to maintain his relation to the society, and assured them every penny he earned above what was necessary barely to sustain his family should be devoted to their common cause. His labours were abundant; in his own neighbourhood he made regular tours through the country around. But a sad interruption came in the unhealthy season, for he was prostrated with an attack of malignant fever, one of his children died of dysentry, and Mrs. Carey's weak mind became entirely and chronically aberrated, and he was compelled henceforth to keep her under restraint. But it seems that whatever secular business he laid his hand upon failed. This indigo business withered away under him. This time, however, the fault was not altogether his, for there was a general depression in the trade. So he threw up his engagement and never attempted business again. While he was overseer he appealed to the society to send out more men for the work, which they did, and despatched Messrs. Marshman, Ward, Brunsden, and Grant. These men experienced the same difficulty in getting a vessel to convey them as Carey had done. There was no chance of the Company's ships taking them, and the Danish fleet had sailed, but an American vessel took them

at last. As they neared Calcutta they were perplexed to know how to land. They decided to avow their purpose, but described themselves as Mr. Carey's assistant at Malda, and when on shore to proceed to the Danish settlement of Serampore. They found the authorities decidedly hostile to them, but the American captain, who was a Presbyterian, fought them through and they got safe to Serampore. This little town is situate on the right bank of the Hooghly, about sixteen miles above Calcutta. There are not many towns in the province so picturesquely and finely situated, and, at the time we write of, it was at the zenith of its power and wealth. The British authorities took umbrage at the asylum provided for these four strangers, but the governor, Col. Bie, a man of small stature but of truly great soul, demanded to know by what right they interfered, and firmly expressed his determination to protect the newly arrived gentlemen. They wrote down to Carey and invited him to come up and make Serampore their common centre and head-quarters. After awhile Lord Wellesley, being assured of their pacific character, removed the interdict a subordinate had placed upon them. Thus the name of this little Indian town is indissolubly connected with the history of missions. Here the five missionaries lived together, ate at one table, and had things common. But they found this was a vicious system, and it was wisely and necessarily abandoned. They soon set to work translating and printing the New Testament in the Bengalee, and when the first sheet was struck off they rejoiced exceedingly and blessed God. They still continued their work of preaching; to their honour be it said, they never degenerated into mere printers or schoolmasters. Morning and afternoon they took their stand in the streets, preaching Jesus and the resurrection. They were often interrupted by the subtle and casuistical Brahmins, or perhaps in the middle of their discourse three parts of the congregation would leave them, some of them making mock salaams, others saying, "Sahib's words are very fine; Sahib knows all Shasters; these are all Shaster words." These preaching excursions brought numbers of inquirers to the mission house, with whom it devolved upon Carey to deal and answer. The missionaries now formed a church, and elected Carey as pastor. They were greatly cheered by the conversion of a Hindoo named Krishnu. He had dislocated his arm, and Thomas, who was with them then, in reducing it spoke to him of the love of God in Christ Jesus to sinners, and as he spoke conviction seized the soul of this poor stranger, till he cried out, "save me, Sahib, save me!" Shortly after this he ate with the missionaries, and so broke his caste, and became a candidate for church membership. His wife and her sister soon followed his steps. The news that Krishnu had thrown up his caste and become a "Feringee" spread rapidly and created quite

a sensation; an uproar was raised, and the power of the magistrate was invoked by the native fanatics; but he refused to interfere, inasmuch as no law had been broken. At length these converts were baptised in the river, while crowds gazed intently upon the service. When the Bengalee New Testament was printed in February 1801, the little church held a day's thanksgiving to God, and the first copy was placed upon the communion table of their chapel; an impression of two thousand copies was struck off.

In April of that year Mr. Carey was appointed teacher of Bengalee and Sanscrit in the new College of Fort William, established by the Marquis of Wellesley. He assumed the office with the distinct understanding that he could not relax any of his duties as a missionary. His salary was five hundred rupees per month; it was afterwards raised to a thousand. The whole of this he devoted to the mission. Indeed, his only motive in accepting the office was the influence it would give him for doing good, and the money he could command for the mission. Their number was reduced to three, "the three," Carey, Marshman, and Ward,—by the death of their colleague, Mr. Thomas having died before. Natives now and again continued to come and join them, some of them as far as from Benares. On the first Sunday in 1802, they had the unspeakable gratification to baptise a convert of the Kapust, or water caste. The position of this order is only second to the Sacerdotal order, and they are frequently superior to them in wealth, intelligence, and influence. In the next month two other Kapusts and a Koolin Brahmin, of the highest grade of Brahminism, threw off their caste; the last took his "poita," or sacred thread, which places its wearer on an equality with the gods, and gives him a right to the homage of all other classes of people, and trampled upon it, and twisted it round his toe. All this would not be done without opposition from the multitude, who were frequently infuriated, and threatened the lives and property of the missionaries and their converts.

Our missionary—professor Carey, nobly exerted himself to create a Bengalee literature. Now three thousand volumes teem from the press annually in this language in Calcutta, but then there was not one. Carey compiled a grammar of the language, and a series of colloquies to familiarise the students with the idiom and ordinary modes of thought and expression. He then compiled a Sanscrit grammar. In these labours he won a place for himself among the great benefactors of India, and obtained great influence with the government; so that when he opened a place of worship in Calcutta he was not opposed. He found it necessary to revise his Bengalee New Testament, and likewise helped to prepare the first fount of type ever produced of the Deva Nagree, the parent of all the alphabets of India. A native blacksmith was his helper, and a youth, Monohor, who has

now for forty years superintended the productions of the beautiful founts of type, of Bengalee, Nagree, Persian, Arabic, and other languages, issued from Calcutta, which have had so much to do with the work of civilisation in the East. In April 1803, Carey performed the first marriage ceremony, between a Brahmin and a Soodra, though such marriages were not legalised by statute till 1852. In the same year another innovation was made upon the curse of caste, in the first Christian funeral of a native. Among the Hindoos, Brahmin carries Brahmin to the funeral pile, and Soodras carry only their own caste. Even students in the dissecting room would not touch the body of a person of another caste. To do the thing effectually, Mr. Marshman helped to carry the body of a Soodra through the street, and required a converted Brahmin, Mahommedan, and Soodra to join him. As they went through the streets they sang the hymn of Krishnu, in Bengalee; "Salvation through the death of Christ."

It is a fact worth remarking that in 1804, before the Bible Society was fairly begun, these Serampore missionaries had issued proposals and made arrangements for translating and publishing the Scriptures in fifteen oriental tongues, most of them Indian, or lands bordering upon India. This was a bold undertaking for three humble men; but they were brave, and devoted, and held it to be their solemn duty to give the Bread of Life to the entire continent of India. The Marhatta was added to their list, for Carey had recently mastered that language, and had compiled a grammar of it for his class in the government college. The Society advanced him £1000 for this work, while Carey procured the assistance of the most learned pundits of the country, who had been gathered to that seat of oriental literature, the Fort William College. At the request of the Royal Asiatic Society, Carey translated the Vedas into English. He had studied these venerable works, for he believed it to be the duty of the missionary to fully understand the Hindoo system of religion and philosophy. So the first Sanscrit work ever printed came from this mission press. Carey also officiated as moderator in the annual disputations of the Fort William students, which were held in the presence of the Governor-General, his suite, and Eastern Rajahs and Princes, arrayed in the gorgeous costumes worn by these nabobs on state occasions, and yet he was forbidden by the Imperial Legislature to reside in the city as a Christian missionary. But he declared openly in one of these brilliant assemblies to Lord Wellesley his vocation and purpose as a minister of the religion of Christ.

At Serampore they continued to work their press, and among other things, issued a series of Sanscrit classics, beginning with Ramayun, the Illiad of Eastern literature. Their success as missionaries fluctuated, sometimes their converts misconducted

themselves or left them, which occasioned them much distress. The Government still looked coldly on them, or else put obstacles in their way, while at the same time openly countenancing idolatry by connecting the notorious shrine of Juggernaut with the Government. These "Brahmised" rulers opposed Christianity and supported idolatry. Their spirit was seen when they charged the missionaries with being the cause of the Vellore munity. But the Commission which sifted the whole case declared judically that there was not the remotest ground for the imputation. Thena war of pamphlets took place, and raged fiercely, in which all kinds of slanders were uttered about these three men, who were labouring quietly but resolutely at Serampore in their noble calling.

An attempt was made to prevent a fresh arrival of missionaries from England from landing; but Carey, by his firmness and prudence, got them ashore and up to Serampore. The whole period of Sir George Barlow's administration, which lasted two years, was marked by bitter opposition to the missionaries.

On the 8th of March, 1807, Mr. Carey received from the Brown University, United States, the diploma of Doctor in Divinity. Never was a distinction more righteously given and more deservedly won. Here is an outline of his truly colossal labours when in Calcutta.—He rose a quarter before six in the morning, read a chapter in the Hebrew Bible, and was till seven occupied in private devotion. He then had family prayer in Bengalee, after which he read Persian with his moonshee. After breakfast he translated the Ramayun with pundits till ten, when he proceeded to his college duties till two. He then translated Jeremiah and dined. After dinner he translated Matthew into Sanscrit. At six he worked on the Telinge with the pundit, he then preached a sermon in English. At the close of the services he proceeded with a translation of Ezekiel in Bengalee. At eleven he closed the duties of the day by reading a chapter in the Greek Testament. Few men could give such a report of their time as this in these milder climes much less in the consuming climate of India. In the midst of these labours his poor wife, after twelve years' insanity, departed this life. Her insanity had been wild and her ravings awful, yet he never allowed it to interfere with his work, though her room was close to his study. Into the history of the rupture between the missionaries and the home society we have no disposition to enter. We have our opinion upon the question after a careful consideration of the case, but we think the unhappy affair should remain in the limbo of oblivion.

Their beloved Serampore was taken possession of by the English, and though it was restored to the Danes in 1815 yet its prosperity declined from this time.

Dr. Carey entered the marriage state again in 1808 with Miss

Charlotte Rhumolir, who had resided at Serampore about as long as the three missionaries. She was of an old Schleswig family; her age was about the same as the Doctor's, and though diminutive in stature, and deformed in person, she was a lady of rare accomplishments, and a linguist; added to which she was devoted to God's service. Before she married she made over her property to the mission cause for the support of native preachers. A calamity of great magnitude befell them in 1812 in the burning of their premises. Translations, books, type, and paper were all consumed. The value of the goods destroyed was £7,000, and of course MSS and printed works were beyond price. They were long in recovering from this catastrophe.

Their last desperate and victorious battle with the government was fought in connection with the Bill for the Renewal of the Charter of the Company. It was determined to make an effort to secure legal permission for Christian missionaries to proceed to India and reside there without molestation. The Bill was not brought in till 1813. There was no such clause in the Bill when it was presented to the Parliament. Mr. Marshman gives an animated and comprehensive sketch of this battle for liberty fought on the floor of the House of Commons. In Mr. Wilberforce the cause of truth found a champion of great gifts of intellect, oratory, and energy. His first speech, of three hours duration, was exhaustive and powerful, and will stand on a par with the greatest speeches ever delivered in the Parliament of England. The issue was that by a majority of twenty-two the House decided the question in favour of truth and freedom. Not long after, Dr. Carey lost by death his dear friends Mr. Sutcliff and Mr. Fuller. Fuller was only sixty-two, but his labours in the good cause wore out his athletic frame and robust constitution. But for his administrative ability, his quenchless zeal and energy, his unfailing resource of originality and invention, and his uniform Christian temper, the Baptist Missionary Society must have failed even in its inception. Few knew his value as well as Dr. Carey, and hence he mourned his loss most deeply.

But to return to our missionary and his coadjutors. We have not space to describe their labours through the following years. The hundreds of persons converted, the schools established, the ambitious project of founding a college, the new translations and re-translations,—all this we cannot dwell upon. Amidst his multifarious duties Dr. Carey found time for botanical and agricultural pursuits. Though he had an extreme, a morbid distaste to letter-writing, yet he kept up correspondence with the most eminent botanists of Europe and America. His own garden, covering five acres of ground, was not surpassed by any in India. It was stocked with the richest and rarest plants collected from all parts of the

world. His bust adorns the hall of the Calcutta Agricultural Society, and in the annual banquet of the society his name is mentioned after the honours paid to the royal family. The king of Denmark sent him a gold medal and a most kindly-worded letter, saying he felt it an honour to have such a man residing in his possessions. His second wife was taken from him by death in 1821. The years in which he enjoyed her society, were, personally considered, the happiest years of his life. In two years he married his third wife, a widow of forty-five. There was little of the exquisite refinement and mental culture about her that had characterised his last wife, yet she was devoted to him and lived to promote his comfort and help him in his work. While this year brought him comfort in his domestic relations, it also brought him sorrow, for he lost his son, Felix, who was one of the most accomplished Bengalee scholars among the Europeans in India. He had translated Goldsmith's History, "Pilgrim's Progress," some scientific manuals, and other works. He had hardly recovered from this blow when another fell upon him in the death of Mr. Ward, his dear friend and fellow labourer, and this too when Dr. Marshman was away in England. He added the Boohtan to the many grammars he compiled. But few of his translations gave him more delight than when as government translator he was requested to render into Bengalee the official prohibition of Suttee. For twenty-five years he had been urging the abolition of this fiendish custom of widows being burnt with the dead bodies of their husbands. Of course the Brahmins and fanatics raised a storm of opposition, but within four months of the promulgation of the edict, twenty-five cases of Suttee had been prevented.

After dragging out its long weary length for years, the unseemly squabble with the society was ended, the missionary property was handed over to the society's trustees and Dr. Carey was freed from the embarrasing cares of the property. He now superintended the opening of a mission to the Cossiahs, one of the most important of the hill tribes of India. But his health began to fail him. He had been attacked half a dozen times during his life in the East with the most deadly forms of fever, and his life was despaired of in most of these cases. He once had an accident that nearly terminated his existence. Indeed he had very little immunity from trouble of the most acute and vexatious character; he had laboured uninterruptedly in a climate commonly fatal to Europeans for forty-one years, and was now in his seventy-fourth year, what wonder that his health failed. His constitution in its roots must have been iron, or he would have died twenty deaths. Of course much is to be set down to rigid temperance in his habits and to his keeping his body and mind in healthy exercise. He never spent an idle hour, he was ever attempting great things for God,

rejoicing in the great things he received from God. He dreaded becoming useless, and prayed that his life might terminate with his capacity to labour. To the last nothing could induce him to relax his labours. Three things deeply interested him to the very end: preaching, translating, and his garden. In reference to the last he said playfully, "When I am gone, brother Marshman will turn the cows into the garden." During his last illness the welfare of the cause nearest his heart was the constant topic of his discourse. He most earnestly and affectionately advised his brethren upon the best means for carrying on their work. The Governor-General, Lord William Bentick, repeatedly visited him. Dr. Wilson, the Bishop of Calcutta, came to his dying bed and sought his benediction. The God whom he had served so long and so faithfully graciously sustained him in the mortal struggle. He quietly and softly fell asleep in Jesus on the 8th of June, 1834. Vast numbers of persons of all classes followed him to his grave.

This poor, unschooled, cobbler has left a fragrant and immortal name. His fame is solid and enduring. His works amply justifies this high praise. Without a spark of what is called genius, with nothing to dazzle, or even surprise, with no imagination or depth of emotion, with only ordinary grasp or force of intellect, with no gifts of eloquence, but with inharmonious voice, limited range of diction, plain, prosaic, and trite as a preacher, and with a dash of rusticity and bluntness in his manner, he has made a place for himself among the immortals. One element of strength in his character was his unimpeachable integrity. There were no trickeries or chicanery in his conduct, there was no deflection from the line of right and duty. He was a man of principle, not a creature of impulse. Nothing moved him, not the thunders of the ruling powers, nor the pitiful sneers, jibes, and sarcasms of Sydney Smith in that infamous article in the "Edinburgh Review" of 1808, which would have been manifestly unfair and bad in an infidel, but positively disgraceful in a Christian minister. Multitudes of tirades were hurled at the head of this "consecrated cobbler," which were meant to hinder him, but they only stimulated him to dare and do more for God. In the fiercest storms he stood like a mountain of strength. He could make no allowance for moral obliquity in others, but when he found a real man he "bound him to his heart with bands of steel." There was the charm of great simplicity in his character. This in youth made him lovely and in age truly venerable.

As a student and a scholar he was unique. We cannot call to mind another instance of such success as he achieved in such circumstances as his. His scientific acquirements would have made him known, but his philological acquirements and labours were simply prodigious. Notwithstanding that he performed all his

duties as a working missionary, yet he compiled grammars of eight languages and dialects of India. He translated a number of other works. He published two dictionaries—the Marhatta and Bengalee; this latter is the foundation of all subsequent works of the kind. In addition he executed, or superintended, the translation of the Scriptures into forty languages or dialects; of these, six comprised the whole Bible, twenty-two the New Testament, five the New Testament and part of the Old, and seven parts of the New Testament. Of course he could only do this vast amount of work by absolutely using every minute of his time, and by inflexibly adhering to the systematic distribution of his work. His only relaxation consisted in turning from one course of study to another. It was no uncommon thing for him to weary three or four pundits in one day, and he himself have other rounds of duties afterwards. We admit he worked too much to do it properly. Here we think he was seriously mistaken. But something must be set down to the fact that he was nearly in each case the beginner. Grammars and dictionaries were alike unknown in most instances. Early lexicographers and translators have peculiar difficulties to encounter. In many cases all that Carey did was to lay a foundation for others to build upon. And it might be that some of the belauded philologers since Carey may be left behind in the march of criticism and become antiquated. Then it must be remarked that his intellect could not deal adequately with the philosophy or genius of a language, but excelled in mastering its rules and details. An eminent pundit, a compiler of an English and Bengalee dictionary, says, "whatever was done towards the revival of the Bengalee, the improvement, indeed the establishment of it as a language, must be attributed to that excellent man, Dr. Carey;" and Dr. H. H. Wilson, and Professor Boden, professor of Sanscrit in the University of Oxford, himself among the first of living oriental scholars, confirms the testimony of the talented native. Before his death, the native literati, while opposed to his purposes and plans, readily acknowledged the importance of his philological labours. His learning, manly character, and sober judgment, made him one of the most influential men in the city of Calcutta, and gave weight to any cause he espoused. The various societies he had so earnestly supported hastened at his death to offer their tribute of respect to his memory. Religiously speaking, the law of his being was self-consecration. He was excelled by none of the missionaries in this respect. He cared little about himself, and not enough about his family—his whole soul was in his work. He kept nothing back. His faith never failed in the ultimate prevalence of God's truth. He unreservedly trusted in Christ his Saviour. His piety was deep, if unobtrusive. Knowing

the man we see how the requirement in his will becomes him—that the only inscription on his tombstone should be—

WILLIAM CAREY,
Born August, 1761, *Died*—

A wretched, poor and helpless worm,
On thy kind arms I fall.

ART. II.—THE GREAT EXPECTATION.

AN EXPOSITION.

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.—Romans viii. 19-23.

THIS passage is open to two different interpretations, to which scholars of equal name and fame attach themselves respectively, some to the one and some to the other. The said interpretations depend upon the sense in which their advocates hold the word *creature* and the word *creation*, which, it ought to be observed, are the self-same word, a circumstance important to the explanation of the entire passage, and favourable withal to the view we prefer in this paper. Some take creature or creation to mean men or human beings in general, irrespective of character. Others apply the word to the inferior creatures, both animate and inanimate. It is a case for the exercise of candour. Much can be said both for and against the respective views. We incline to adopt the second interpretation, which has the sanction of antiquity in its favour, an item not to be despised in casting up the whole account. We suppose there is a bold personification by which the irrational creatures, and even the insensible frame of the world, are represented as suffering and sympathising with God's children in their militant struggles. Accepting this idea, we will

attempt an exposition of the passage as plain and easy as we can make it. There comes to be considered,—

I. A PERIOD OR CONSUMMATION EXPECTED.—"*The manifestation of the sons of God.*" This we take to mean the glorification of believers at the last day, the vindication of their character, and the perfect happiness then commencing, and thenceforward continuing. The judgment-day will be a revealing time which will bring forth out of obscurity a great number of persons not previously known or understood. It will confirm or correct our opinions of men whether good or bad, and will diminish or exalt them in our esteem in the exact measure in which we misapprehended their character or misinterpreted their conduct. The following passages express what we intend: "Every man's work shall be *made manifest;* for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." 1 Cor. iii. 13. "Therefore judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will *make manifest* the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man have praise of God." 1 Cor. iv. 5. "And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels. And I will spare them as a man spareth his son that serveth him. Then shall ye return and *discern between the righteous and the wicked,* between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not." Mal. iii. 17, 18. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world *knoweth us not,* because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." 1 John iii. 1, 2. Harmonious with these is the closing clause of the section under review: "Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." In that adopting day, there will be a public acknowledgment of all who ever sustained a holy character, in any position, under every dispensation, and in every land and nation. It will be their day of "manifestation." They were perfectly known to their Father long before that event. "The Lord knoweth them that are his." 2 Tim. ii. 19. However obscure they be, however hidden by lowly circumstances, crushed by persecution, or clouded by prejudice, he knows them and will bring them out into light and honour. He will see to their vindication. The higher orders of being (commonly so accounted [?]) shall know them. Our Lord has told us that he will take their names up into his lips and pronounce them in the audience of the heavenly host. "Also I say unto you, whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of Man also confess before the angels of God." Luke xii. 8. Wicked men shall know

them. The prejudice that would not see the beauty of their character, shall be confronted with the brightest evidence and confounded by the noblest testimony. The malice that abused their names and their persons shall blush with the deepest confusion to witness the honours conferred on them. "The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee, and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." Isa. lx. 14. Devils shall know them, and own them to be the true seed of grace, and be shut up to the acknowledgment that it was not for the sake of the hedge encircling their persons or property that they served God, (Job i. 10,) but from genuine moral principle and filial love. They shall know each other. Good men do not know how many brethren they have. Sectional differences keep them aloof from each other and limit them. They are too often contracted with denominational feeling, and look on themselves and their party as being the faithful few. Moreover, there is a geographical separation. The children of God are "scattered abroad," dispersed in many lands, and living in nooks and corners remote from the thronged thoroughfares of public life. When the day of muster shall arrive, and the jubilee trumpet shall be blown, many sons will be brought to glory. Companies of "seven thousand" will come trooping up from quarters whence they were not expected, and their surprised brethren will say, "These, where have they been?" We are in no position at present to number Israel. As easily as not we might count some into the family who do not belong to it, and leave unacknowledged several of the genuine members. What marvel is it that a blind world knows us not when we scarcely know one another! We may forgive them for not knowing us. There is little to distinguish us from them, little of anything that they care for, little of outward grandeur or worldly superiority. And then our *character*, which is the main point of distinction, is often so feeble, indefinite, and undemonstrative (shame be to us), that they would have to look very closely at us, more so than they care to do, to discover the difference between us and themselves. The princes of the blood go in disguise, wearing homely garments and an ordinary head-dress; so that the eyes of the world have not penetration sufficient to know them. But the day of manifestation comes on apace. Their disguise will be thrown off. Instead of common robes they will put on royal attire, and on their brows shall glitter crowns that never fade nor lose their lustre. What a desirable consummation! Let us look next at—

II. THE EXPECTANT PARTY. "*The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for*"—*this*. "Earnest expectation" is one word in the original text, though it is a compound word. There is no

distinct word for the adjective "earnest"; but the noun is emphatic enough to warrant such a translation, and its force is even greater than the translation conveys. The ideal notion is that of an "outstretched neck or head thrust forward," peering into the future and looking for a goal of happiness. The same word Paul uses to express his own state of mind in prospect of martyrdom: "According to my *earnest expectation* and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death." Philip. i. 20. The earnest expectation in the passage before us is, singularly enough, the expectation of the creature, or otherwise rendered, of the *creation*. This we understand, not of men, but of things surrounding men, namely, animals and the senseless frame of the world. There is something of rhetoric in the statement. In sober fact the creatures are incapable of such expectancy. Yet how often we find irrational and senseless things spoken of as doing what is only proper for persons. On the release of the covenant nation from captivity, surrounding objects are put into unison with them as if participating in their happiness: "For ye shall go out with joy and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands." Isa. lv. 12. And if on an occasion so comparatively light and limited, the mountains shall look glad and sing and the trees shake themselves for joy, what demonstrations shall the creation make when the sons of God come of age and are received to their abiding mansions!

Let us make space for candour. There is another way of explaining "the creature." It sometimes has application to the world of men. So those who hold the other view are not without available quotation to prove that "every creature" means all men. "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to *every creature*." Mark xvi. 15. "If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel which ye have heard, and which was preached to *every creature* which is under heaven, whereof I Paul am made a minister." The term creature is capable of either application. And whether we adopt the one view or the other, there are difficulties. We think we find the fewest and the least formidable objections in that way of regarding the passage that we have preferred. It is true that things cannot hope or expect. The day of manifestation cannot be, strictly speaking, an object of desire to senseless matter or to the animals. Is it not as true that moral beings, estranged and alienated as the bulk of them are, have no desire or longing for the day of Christ? They not only have no desire for such a day, but they have a positive dislike to it, and a

dread of it, and a wish that there never may be any such day, since it will be to them a day of doom. Sinners, as such, desiring the day of manifestation, would be against all sense and reason. They would be worse than the parties addressed by Amos, who hoped for benefit from some coming event, called "the day of the Lord," but were doomed to punishment when it should come. "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light." Amos v. 18.

We hold to the idea that the creature means the creation as distinct from man and external to him. And although we allow that there is part rhetoric in the language, there may be an underlying basis of truth and soberness. There is reason to think that the creation, blotted and dimmed by sin, has the prospect of being beautified, regenerated, and improved when the consequences of sin shall have been fully counteracted in respect to ransomed men. From the Scripture we learn that the powers of external nature are in a deteriorated state, and that sin was the cause of such deterioration, which however is not final. The 20th and 21st verses are to this purport; "The creature was made subject to vanity." Vanity, sometimes applied in a moral sense for wickedness, properly means weakness, frailty, emptiness, or unprofitableness. Predicated of inferior creatures it may mean "pain," or comparative uselessness. No one can look on the world as it is without seeing on it the imprint of vanity. The soil is under a curse. Read Genesis iii. 17, 18, and you cannot avoid the impression that the crust of the earth which yields food in answer to watchful tillage and care, is not so generous in its returns as it would have been if sin had not entered. The Adamic sin has affected and interfered with the fruitfulness of nature. And the sin of others since have occasionally operated for evil in particular localities. In modern times we weary ourselves to explain blights and famines or failing crops upon natural principles. The Scripture uniformly traces such things to the misbehaviour of men: "He turneth rivers into a wilderness and the water-springs into a dry ground; a fruitful land into barrenness (saltness) for the wickedness of them that dwell therein." Ps. cvii. 33, 34. Sodom and Gomorrah furnish an example. Before their overthrow the region round about was as the garden of God, but was afterwards laid under a lasting curse. And in this matter we must trace all up to God in point of agency. There is no evil in this sense but he does it. The creature was made subject to vanity *by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.* We think this points out the agent of the subjection, and not the moral cause, nor the meddling tempter. It is a false delicacy and ignorance of Scripture teaching that lead men to explain this of Adam by reason of whose sin

it was the creation was damaged, or of satan by whom he was ensnared into the great offence. He who subjected the same in hope no doubt is God, who forms the light and creates darkness, and makes peace and creates evil. To him all things are subject. It is his prerogative to rule the world and determine the condition of things. And he saw it fit that man's surroundings should bear the stigma of his sin. Therefore he put the mark of his displeasure on the creature till he should by his gracious purpose and counsel counterwork the offence, when he will take off again that he has imposed, and restore the primal state. The creature was subjected *in hope.* It sunk along with man to whose good it was intended to minister, and when he is elevated again, as he will be (minus that fraction of the race that will be lost), the creature will share with him, and its disgrace be wiped away. So the 21st verse says most expressly. The particulars and details of this, the creature's prospective and final condition, we pretend not to deal with. Towards this things are tending every hour, and the expectant creature bends forward its neck and directs its eager look—waiting. Nor is the creature the only expectant of this coming glory. There is another party more deeply interested in the event. The sons of God, to whom all nature is but a servant and a helper, have this earnest expectation. As their interest in the affair turns up again at a later part of the text we dismiss them for the present and pass on to another division of our subject.

III. THE PREPARATORY GROANING AND TRAVAIL. "*Groaning*" and "*travail*," the terms expressly used, are both of sad and heavy import. Before the happy consummation is realised deep groans will be heard. The groaning, long since begun, and till now continued, will deepen towards the issue. And it is not from one point that the groans proceed. The "whole" groans. Of course particular parts groan.

The land groans. It was burdened with a curse from the mouth of its Maker, and his word is with power and will not return dishonoured. At the breath of his mouth the fig-tree withers away. At his bidding the fruitful earth turns niggard of its vivifying energies and gives them forth with a scant. It groans under man's foot-fall as if it bore disgrace in supporting him. Like a thing of sense, it bears its protest against his crimes, and the abuses he enacts upon its surface. "The earth mourneth and fadeth away, the world languisheth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languish. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate; therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left." Isa. xxiv. 4-6. "How long shall the land mourn, and the

herbs of every field wither for the wickedness of them that dwell therein?" Jer. xii. 14. "Because of swearing the land mourneth." Jer. xxiii. 10. From the time that the soil drank in the blood of Abel, and cried to God against the enormity, even to this hour, there are voices and sighs out of the ground. As if shocked at man's conduct the soil has very rarely done its best, but has put men off with a moiety of its resources and virtues. "It shall not yield to thee her strength."

The animals groan. Especially those of them that come under servitude to man, groan. The remoter from him the better for them. Hence those of them that range free in open wilds beyond the limits of civilised haunts and habits, live in comparative happiness. "They bow themselves, they bring forth their young ones, they cast out their sorrows. Their young ones are in good likeing, they grow up with corn; they go forth and return not unto them." Job xxxix. 3, 4. Having no human keeper, but left to God alone, their sorrows are light and transient. Their civilised brethren honoured to wait on men, and lackey after them, groan deeper groans, loaded, and whipped, and spurred as they are, often for mere amusement and recreation, and oftener still for man's favourite pastime—gain and money-making. Domestic animals have sent many a groan of information to heaven against their lords and masters. Moreover, they have had to groan for hunger when their unworthy owners have provoked God to stop supplies and send "cleanness of teeth" as a punishment. Thus Joel writes—"How do the beasts *groan*, the herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture, yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate." Joel i. 18. "And Ahab said unto Obadiah, Go into the land, unto all fountains of water, and unto all brooks; peradventure we may find grass to save the horses and mules alive, that we lose not all the beasts." 1 Kings xviii. 5. To this we may add the carnage and sufferings of noble animals in war. We take notice, too, of

The groans of innocent children. The sufferings of infants make a hard chapter in the book of providence. Their groans, and sighs, and pains coming on them, irrespective of personal desert, rather shock our sense of justice. We are apt to view the arrangement that involves them, as exceptionable in point of equity. We feel disturbed in our minds even when we have connected them with Adam, till we connect them with Christ, and draw upon the future "manifestation," when their groaning will be balanced, and recompensed, and explained.

The groans of wicked men, we take the liberty to name. They are scarcely due in this account, as they bear no relation to the desired result. The sinful and disobedient amongst men are the objects of the groaning rather than the subjects. They make misery for others to groan over. They laugh while others weep. We cannot say that they do not groan. They do, but they do not

groan in concert with an expectant world. Their groans are blind, atheistic, and purposeless, and are not related to the "manifestation," but rather are prelusive of an everlasting lament. "There shall be weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth."

Good men groan. So the 23rd verse reads, "And not only they but ourselves also . . . . even we ourselves groan." Not only the inferior creatures, but ourselves who are rational and are in favour with God, groan. After becoming subjects of grace we are still subject to the tax imposed on the whole world. We groan although we are the children of God. The new relationship brings us no instant relief or present indemnity from the physical consequences of the fall. The remoter and eternal consequences are thrown off. Believers will never know them. The pain, and suffering, and frailty brought on us by the fall cleave to us more or less through the entire extent of our probation. Conversion makes no difference in these except so far as it ministers to temperate and orderly habits. It is the soul that is converted and not the body, although the body itself expects a conversion on the day of "manifestation." In the meantime the tasking adversities of life shall be disciplinary and our groans shall be tributary to our good. We must not conclude that a state of frailty and mortality is inconsistent with our prospective glory. It is no doubt even necessary to mature us for heaven. For a picture of the case we will furnish an illustration. Say, here is a poor boy whom a nobleman thinks good to adopt and elevate above the condition to which he was born. It is thought fit, however, by his generous benefactor, not to be too tender of him in his minority, but to reserve his fortune in his own hand till the boy has attained the age of manhood. The boy must go to school, and at the expiring of his school term serve an apprenticeship to a trade, both of which things will be tributary to his equipment for the station he expects to fill. This heir-expectant will find awkward and unpleasant matters to grapple with in threading his way through such an exercising minority. The rod may come upon his back or his fingers. His blunders may draw the frown of his master upon him. His fellow-apprentices may abuse and annoy him. In the midst of all this he begins to reason with himself about his large prospects for life. Like a simple youth he might think how utterly unsuited to his hopes his present condition was. He talks to himself in something like the following strain:—"Well! I am to be a gentleman after my seven years' servitude is finished. I shall not be dogged by task-masters and insulted by low-born mechanics then, as I am now. My hands will not be soiled with labour then as now. But why should I be subject to such drudgery even now? My father who has adopted me is rich enough, and I shall have large means at my disposal—what use will this filthy trade be to

me? Why does not my father have me acknowledged in the forum or in the gate of the city at once! Ah me, my lot is hard!" It would be easy to reason down his repinings, if you heard him soliloquising in the foregoing style. You say to him, "Has this gentleman really engaged to lift you above your present condition on your attaining maturity?" "He has." "How do you know?" "Documents signed by his own hand are in my possession in which he pledges himself to give me all the advantages of a child and heir." "You are sure you have the papers?" "Perfectly certain." "Very good, then, have done with your unreasonable complaints, and bear the trifling hardships of your servitude like a man!" What you think this boy should do, my brethren, do you. We are at school now, or at service. We are liable to knocks and blows; and sometimes vile hands administer the lash. The rod of the wicked does not *rest* on the lot of the righteous; yet it is used occasionally. On various accounts we are made to groan. Sometimes we are visited "with strong pain," which forces a groan from us. The pain is our apology. The groan belongs to our condition in the body. "We that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened." 2 Cor. v. 4. Bereavement makes us sigh. Some dear to us as ourselves are taken from us, and pass away to heaven, and we look after them as if we were unwilling to remain when they are gone. To part with such is like the severance of a limb, and a groan may be excused. Then we groan over our sins, over the remnants of sin that we find in ourselves, or if we find no remnants, we mourn our former sins, pardoned though they be, and groan besides over the sins of others, and the miseries we see in close neighbourhood to us. Sometimes, too, we groan under insult, and reproach, and wrongs that we suffer, from enemies and false friends, and from the misconstructions of those who really love us but misapprehend our words or deeds. We cannot but groan under these things. Our care must be not to complain. All this must be and more. In the rear of all these things there comes our dissolution. We must embrace the dust at last and lie, it may be, in long dishonour there. And what then? All this is comportable with our final glorification and necessarily forerıns it. Paul means to insinuate that it appears strange that there should be this wide difference between our present and our future. And heightens the contrast by bringing in the fact that we have earnests of heaven, and still we have to groan. "Even we ourselves *which have the first fruits of the Spirit.*" If he spoke as an apostle in this way he might mean, as some explain, miraculous endowments, with which apostles and others were dowered in primitive times. A better explanation makes the first-fruits to mean the grace of the Spirit beautifully conferred on all believers. As first-fruits were an earnest and sample of harvest and vintage, so the Spirit

of God dwelling in believers, bearing witness to their adoption, and gendering in them heavenly dispositions, is the fore-pledge, evidence, and ante-past of future glory. It looks strange to us that lofty as our hopes are, and favoured as we are with remittances and draughts from heaven, we are still drilled and exercised with hardships. Let us say, amen, to all that our Father appoints. And when we groan let us do it decently, submissively, and as privately as possible. It is thought that such an idea is couched in the wording—"even we ourselves groan *within ourselves;*" as if it had said, we do not groan out, we suppress complaint and outward demonstration, not making louder signs than our suffering warrants, but keeping within bounds. So Job said, "my stroke is heavier than my groaning." Job. xxiii. 2.

It is to be observed that the groaning is in concert. The whole creation groaneth "together." There is union, or sympathy of parts with each other. Such sympathy is twice expressed to any one who reads the pure Greek text, for the preposition which signifies concurrence is prefixed to both verbs. Very patiently and fully rendered it would be "groaneth *together*" and "travaileth in pain *together*." It is as if the whole creation sympathised with suffering Christians and bore them company in their distresses, uttering groan for groan.

This groaning is the precursor of life and happiness. Out of all this sorrow and sighing there will spring at last an anthem of gladness. These sighs will be exchanged for songs. Groaning has different issues. Sometimes it foreruns death, but otherwise it is the harbinger of coming life. They are not death-groans which are now heaved so deep and frequent, but hopeful indications of a noble birth that will be hailed with a general joy. The accompanying word "travailing" shows that a new-born dispensation of things is looked for, which though preceded by much anxiety and suffering will bring in a large balance of glory, for joy of which the former troubles will be all forgotten.

This is what we wait for—"the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." This "adoption" is identical with the aforesaid "manifestation," verse 19. There is an earlier adoption co-temporary with conversion. But it is private, known to the individual's self, and possibly to a few others, whereas this named in our text will be quite public. This is spoken after the manner of men, after the style of Romans, whose usage was, in respect to adoption, to have two ceremonies. The first was done before a limited circle of persons in a private character. The second, which followed after a shorter or longer interval of time, was done off in the forum or market-place and was witnessed by as many as chose to be present. Answerable to this each believer in Christ is adopted when he first believes and receives the adopting seal. This is com-

paratively private and close. The adoption waited for will be open and public. It will take place at a general gathering summoned by the tongue of the "last trump." The world shall be present to hear the "children of the resurrection" named and acknowledged.

"The redemption of our body" is co-temporary with that adoption, some say identical with it, its close succession putting it in apposition, though others think the "adoption" is of wider reach than the body's redemption, which is but a part of a greater whole. The recovery of our body will be indeed a redemption, a deliverance. In the dusty chambers of death it was held as a prisoner, chained down, locked in, and left in darkness. This prisoner of hope shall be released and set at large at a given hour, long since fixed, which can neither be hastened nor delayed. It will be forthcoming in a highly improved condition, nobler far than when it was committed, full of life, and lustre, and beauty, and strength, after the type of the Saviour's glorified body.

Believers, suffer the word of exhortation. Live as candidates for such glory ought to live. Bear with adversity, suppress complaint, and cut short your weeping. Nurse your hopes, and balance the glorious future with the suffering present. Above all things take care of the roll of adoption given you on your reception into the family of grace. "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

Should any unconverted person read these lines, and feel even a touch of desire to share with the "sons" in their future inheritance, we speak him kindly. There is love enough in the bosom of the Father to include numbers more in the covenant of grace. It is not so made that just so many and no more, and just such and such persons and none other, can participate in its benefits. None but the adopted will realise heirship. But adoption is an offer made to all, and it is available to be accepted of any. Lay aside your stupor, and groan for acceptance. Everything around you groans. Why should you be indifferent with so great an interest at stake? Shame on you to be at ease! Cast yourself down at mercy's door and groan for entrance. Most certainly the door will open and the voice of welcome bid you in as the blessed of the Lord.

T. G.

ART. III.—EXTREMES IN MODERN THEOLOGICAL TEACHING.

The complete works of the Rev. John Kirk, Edinburgh. Revised and corrected by the Author. 2 vols., 8vo. Glasgow: John Tweed. 1861.

Sermons by Mr. J. C. Philpot. Stamford: John Ford, Red Lion Square. London: John Gadsby, Fleet Street.

FALSE religions seem to have a firmer hold of the human heart than the religion of truth. The Mahommedan, the Pagan, the Romanist, has a more unwavering faith in his creed, and yields a more devoted and earnest obedience to his ritual, than the evangelical Christian. Nor is there in the religion of superstition, such a diversity of faiths, or such a multitude of sects as in the religion of truth. These facts furnish an interesting though perplexing field of investigation and inquiry. Were we asked which religion would exert the most powerful influence upon the human mind, whether that of error or that of truth, we should doubtless answer, "That of truth to be sure," for such a conclusion the *a priori* mode of reasoning involves. And this conclusion is really the true one, if we have regard in our inquiries to an influence of a good, wholesome, and permanent kind. But when our investigations have reference to present and apparent effects only—effects such as they are, both with regard to kind and degree—then the palm must be yielded to the religion of superstition and error. Are the followers of Brahmah divided? Are there a hundred different and conflicting forms of Mahommedanism? Whoever heard of, or saw a public discussion between two believers in the Koran, respecting any one of the doctrines or ceremonies taught therein? Or what true Christian or Christian teacher has ever excelled or equalled the disciple of the false prophet, or the Romanist, in his attentions to the ceremonies or forms prescribed by his religion? How difficult it is for the former to take up his cross, and avow his religion in the midst of circumstances which make his doing so somewhat painful; whereas the latter will perform his devotions with the greatest apparent solemnity and earnestness, even when surrounded by thousands who have no sympathy, either with his creed or his practice.

For this there must be a cause; and that cause we think it is not difficult to find. We cannot place it in the religions themselves, nor yet in the minds of their respective disciples. It may

be that this complacency of mind towards the religion of error and superstition does, in part, arise from the ease with which mere ceremony is performed, compared with the pain which rigid self-denial—one of the demands which Christianity makes upon its disciples—occasions; but we must trace it up to the action of Satanic power before we can arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem. Filled with enmity against God, and bent upon defeating those purposes which he has had, and still has, so much at heart, Satan has ever turned his deadly hatred against that truth which is the "power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." No other religion can hurt, but rather aid the kingdom of darkness. For this reason no other is assailed. Every other is fostered by the "prince of the power of the air." Their disciples are blinded by the god of this world; and instead of being urged on to assail them, they are encouraged to regard them with superstitious reverence, and to perform their ritual requirements with unquestioning devotedness. Otherwise is it with the religion of the Saviour. Much is gained by the adversary of souls when he can keep his servants in ignorance of it, or arouse their indignation against it; but more is gained when he can induce its professed friends to depart from its vital principles; to ignore or assail its fundamental truths; to quarrel about its non-essentials; to divide on trifles; or to be ashamed to confess their faith before men.

Looking at the subject in this light, or bearing these facts in mind, it is not to be wondered at, if he who preaches the essential principles of Christ's religion the most faithfully and boldly, should have but a scanty following, or should be evil spoken of, whilst he who (having the charms of person and oratory,) substitutes form for power, and practically ignores regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and a deep, rich, and powerful experience in the hearts of Christians, should be followed and praised by men of the world. No preacher, knowing these things, can wish to be popular with the unconverted, or desire anything else than to be made an instrument of good to Zion's travellers, or to those who are "standing in the ways." A large and fashionable congregation, crowding the pews and aisles of chapel or of church, swelling the praise of the officiating minister, is no proof of the orthodoxy of the creed, or of the usefulness of the teacher; but when we, on the other hand, hear the ungodly declaim against a certain kind of teaching, and ridicule the teacher, there is a strong probability that the truths which save, and the man whom God delights to honour, are covertly assailed. The headway which pure Gospel truth has made in the world is the strongest external evidence of its Divinity. What else but divine power can have kept the Gospel alive? It denounces whatever the carnal mind loves; it goes against the rapid current of sinful affection; yet it

thrives and spreads. It humbles high looks; it brings down whatever exalts itself against God and his Anointed; and it flourishes amid the icy and withering influences of a wordly and rebellious race.

Satanic agency has something to do with sectarian differences. We may not ascribe all to Providence. Divine wisdom may see it good to permit such differences and quarrels; but a power diverse therefrom must be in part their cause. We cannot think that God led Calvin and Arminius to their respective creeds, or approved of the differences of Toplady and Wesley. And will any Bible reader pronounce us visionary when we say, that if either of these pair of truly good men had sought council of God, with child-like willingness to be taught, they would have arrived at a clear and united knowledge of the truth, each seeing eye to eye with the other?

We have at the head of this paper the names of two men of equal earnestness, but of diverse sentiment. Mr. Kirk is at the head of a large and powerful sect, holding views the most ultra in reference to freewill and the ability of man to become now, and with perfect ease, a true and safe Christian; whilst Mr. Philpot is the representative of views the most Calvinistic, denying to man the least measure of free-will in matters of saving religion, or the smallest modicum of power to draw nigh to God. The former scheme is Sandimanianism elaborated and intensified; the latter is Calvinism in its most honest and ultra form, keeping free, however, from the terrible licentiousness of Antinomianism. Both men are clever and earnest; each has given proof of his zeal in the sacrifices he has made and in the labours he has endured. But both cannot be right; each cannot make known the truth; if the one preach the truth as it is in Jesus, the other is circulating fatal error.

It is not the object of this paper to exalt the one man above the other, nor to recommend the one creed to the exclusion of the other; but to find fault with both, and to try to show that the truth lies between them.

The two large and well-printed volumes of Mr. Kirk contain a mass of clear and well-written theology, doctrinal, practical, and experimental. The style is earnest, chaste, and luminous; but lacks tersness and energy. The author seems bent upon making his reader a convert to his views. Much of his writing is in dialogue form, and this is by far the most racy, interesting, and convincing of what he has written. Therein he grapples with every real and possible objection which is or may be felt to his scheme. And therein the scheme itself is fully drawn out and laid bare. Eternal election and particular redemption are mercilessly exposed and denounced, and an effort is made to show that personal salvation is the easiest attainable thing in the universe. The fears,

doubts, darkness, sorrow, bewilderment, distraction, and other emotional annoyances which are familiar to most minds which have a religious bent, are placed, in almost every case, to the account of ignorance, false teaching, or some other accidental cause; and a cure thereof is invariably sought in the letter of God's word. The scheme of the author supposes the possibility of securing a mind perfectly calm, ever sunshiny, always rejoicing; free from doubt, darkness, conflict, and worry; and this simply by the mind's own action on the revealed love of God. However plausible this may sound or seem in theory, the experience of every true Christian is against it; besides which it makes the Saviour's statement impossible of realisation, "Through much tribulation ye shall enter the kingdom." The idea which runs through the entire scheme of Mr. Kirk is, that man is saved by the action of his mind upon Bible revelation; whereas the idea which pervades most other schemes of theology, which shines resplendent on the pages of the Bible itself, which underlies the redeeming plan, which the act and spirit of prayer involve, and which has grown up with us from earliest recollection, namely, that man is saved by the action of the Spirit of God on his mind and heart, by means of his own word, is set aside. Spiritualism, super-naturalism, is almost entirely ignored in these volumes, and simple intellectualism is the prevailing feature of the scheme. Man is everywhere, and in every case, called upon to believe that God loves him; that he is reconciled to him; that no sin but that of unbelief—the unbelief of not believing that he is now a redeemed man—stands between God and him; repentance is a cold, formal, unemotional intention of becoming a Christian; saving faith is a belief that God is reconciled unto him by the death of Jesus; regeneration is not a quickened, renewed heart, but an outward change resulting from a belief in the doctrines of the cross; forgiveness is not a felt blessing, but one which is simply credited because announced in the Bible; the witness of the Spirit is the testimony of Bible declaration, and not His whisper in the heart; whilst sanctification is simply obedience to the ten commandments! We are told in these volumes that every act we perform, previous to the act of believing that God loves us, is sinful; that we have no faith at all unless we have faith in that one point; and that even the most earnest agonising prayer of a broken-hearted penitent is of no avail till he believes the said thing! It is clear, also, that our author has little regard for emotional Christianity. He looks upon the mere assent of the mind to the Gospel testimony as of infinitely vaster worth than all the emotions, impressions, illuminations, elevations of feeling, and the like, which can be named. We are told again and again that feeling is nothing, and that the crediting of the Gospel testimony is everything; for so long as

this testimony is credited, he who credits it is a pardoned, adopted, regenerated man, let his feelings and frames be ever so cold, hard, dark, or wretched! This scheme has obtained a wide currency and met with a hearty reception of late years. It has gained converts even in cool and sober-minded Scotland; it has inoculated many Independent churches in England; a college has been built in Glasgow for the training of preachers to inculcate it, whilst scores of ministers in all denominations have adopted its views, at least in part. We do not wonder at this, though we deplore it. As we said at the beginning of this paper, sentiments like these are congenial to the human mind; and they form part of the tares which the enemy is seeking to sow amongst the growing wheat of scriptural truth.

Now we object to this scheme, because it is contrary to the teachings of holy writ; and, therefore, must be highly dangerous. Practically, it is removed but a short distance from Antinomianism; for it wraps men up in the belief that they are safe, whatever their feelings be. "Frames and feelings," so much prized by most Christians, and so much sought after and rejoiced in by the writers of the Psalms, and by other "holy men of old," are bowed out of court by Mr. Kirk. Now we emphatically affirm that if the Holy Spirit does not act upon the human mind, salvation is impossible. Regeneration is necessary to salvation, and in all cases God begins that work in the hearts of men. Did he wait till man began it, it would in no case whatever be begun. And should he refuse to acknowledge a man, that man might act on God's truth, yea upon God himself, as he pleased, and yet all would end in nothing. "Many will seek to enter in, and shall not be able;" "They shall call upon me, but I will not answer;" "I will mock when your fear cometh;" "Many will say to me in that day, have we not prophesied in thy name; but I will confess unto them, I never knew you;" "every plant which my Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up;"—these are a few passages of holy writ which none can read without seeing that man may act on God's truth by believing, professing, and even teaching it, and lose his soul after all. If a belief that I am a saved man, because I believe that Jesus by the grace of God tasted death for me, is enough, then we ask what need is there for that examination "whether we be in the faith," which Paul enforces, and what need is there to keep the heart with all diligence, and to mortify the deeds of the body, that we may live? We look upon "frames and feelings," of which so little account is made in those volumes, as the most sacred and precious treasure which man can enjoy. A humble mind, a contrite heart, a glowing zeal, a blooming hope, a tender conscience, joy in the Lord, communion with God, and such like emotions and mental acts, we would not be without for worlds. He who, while

professing Christianity, knows nothing of them, or is content to live without them, even for a month or a week, is as devoid of salvation as is the most profligate man, for they are the invariable concomitants of true faith. The writers of the Psalms sought their enjoyment with strong cries; deplored their absence amid floods of tears; and exulted both before God and men when they were their portion. It seems to us that an indiscriminate offer of the assurance of salvation, a calling on any one to believe in the reconciliation of God to him, is not warranted in the Bible. While no outward work, or inward preparation, is needed to *deserve* salvation, yet a certain state of mind is necessary to *receive* it. We have not yet been able to induce any one to come to Christ, except he who felt his need of him. However much believing with the heart is ridiculed in these volumes, as being unphilosophical, it is, nevertheless, the only kind of believing which ends in salvation. Every one to whom pardon was offered by the apostles was an anxious inquirer. If a mere intellectual assent to Gospel declaration is sufficient, we see not the need of a Divine agent to bring men to God. The "drawing" of the Father, as a preparation for the Saviour, is defined by Mr. Kirk as intellectual instruction, imparted by the Scriptures; but this is seen to be a fiction in the multitude of texts which show us who they are whom God is ready to receive or to bless. It is, for example, the *poor* and *needy* whom God will enrich; the *mourner* whom he is willing to comfort; the *destitute* whose cry he is ready to hear; he who *hungers* and *thirsts* after righteousness is the man who is to be blessed and filled. All through these volumes, pre-eminency is given to the *word* rather than to the *Spirit* of God; but while we are ready to grant that it is the duty of the anxious soul to accept the outward testimony as his warrant for believing, yet he is not called upon to stay there, but is required by the word of God, by the scheme of redemption, and by the experience of the household of faith, to look for the corroboration or proof of his faith, in the fruits of the Spirit in his heart; for if he has really believed to the saving of his soul, the kingdom of God, which is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, will be IN HIM; he who commanded light to shine out of darkness, will have shined into his heart with warmth and healing; the Saviour will manifest himself unto him as he does not to the world, and God will show him tokens for good. Not only so, but he will have evidence of another, but equally indubitable kind. Satan, for instance, will at times be allowed to sift him as wheat; he will now and then be in heaviness through manifold temptations; he will have conflicts between the flesh and the spirit, in which he will strive to put off the old man with his affections and lusts; he will have fellowship with Christ in his sufferings; he will be led out to pray with all prayer, and to watch

thereunto with all perseverance; in short, from the cross to the crown, he will have an experience peculiar to himself as a Christian, and without which he would have no more right to be called a Christian than a living creature without the attributes of a human being would have to be called a man.

Much more might be said in condemnation of the teaching in these volumes, did the limits of our article allow of it. We have not referred to "chapter and verse" in proof of our assertions, but we hesitate not to say that he who is familiar with the scheme upon which we have animadverted, will give us credit for having given an honest view of it, so far as we have gone. It would have been pleasing to our feelings had we been able to present something of a commendatory character; but so dangerous are its leading principles, that our hearty wish is, that the volumes before us were out of existence, and that the sect whose views they advocate, may either die out speedily, or adopt a sounder faith.

We now turn to a man and to a system as diverse as possible. Mr. Philpot is an aged man, crowned with honour—the honour of being true to conscience. Thirty-six years ago he held an Oxford fellowship, was a clergyman of the church of England, and gloried in his church, and in the position he held therein. But a baptism of fire awaited him. Though a learned ecclesiastic, like Nicodemus, yet like him he was dead to spiritual religion. But the Lord opened his eyes, and quickened his dead soul. Weeks and months of heart-travail succeeded. At length he became a new creature in Christ Jesus. He tried to remain a clergyman, but could not. The inconsistencies and mockeries of the liturgy and of ritualism, which he had constantly to read and perform, offended his conscience; and though dependant upon his fellowship for subsistence, he saw at length that he could not eat the Church's bread while he objected to do its work. Giving up his fellowship and renouncing the Church, he embraced rigid Calvinian sentiments (the only true and honest form of the system) and believer's baptism. John Warburton baptised him. For several years, Stamford and Oakham have been the scenes of his ministrations. Men of education and polish, like himself, being scarce in the community of his adoption, he stands head and shoulders above his brother-ministers in respect of learning and culture. For years his Sabbath day utterances have been sent to the press, and now scores of his sermons are in print. We have a bundle of them before us. They exhibit a mind of no ordinary capacity and attainment, though we fancy he studiously avoids any display of his learning. Whatever amount of preparation he makes for the pulpit, and we judge that it is but scanty, it is clear that his sermons are not sent to the press without careful revision. Mainly experimental and doctrinal in character, there is yet a pleasing variety and freshness

in them. The style is clear, dignified, and elegant; the arrangement natural and logical. We have none of the vulgarism which marks the utterances of some others of this school of preachers. Between Philpot and Wells, the notorious preacher at the Surrey Tabernacle, there is as great a contrast as there is between light and darkness. Seldom does he declaim against the upholders of systems of theology which differ from his own. In the sermons we have read, we have seen but one instance of rudeness, and that is the not uncommon one of giving to the Primitive Methodists (a people he could not but respect did he know them better) the vulgar nickname which is fast dying out in all quarters where self-respect is held in its true value. (Vide sermon, "Heir of Heaven," &c.) Though Mr. Philpot looks upon Calvinism with reverential affection, yet many of these discourses are such as every spiritual Christian may read with pleasure and profit, for therein true Christian experience is, for the most part, delineated with a clearness, depth, and richness truly edifying; whilst the work, character, offices, and love of the Saviour, are described so as to gladden and refresh the Christian's heart. Though we dissent from some of the doctrines taught in these sermons, and sincerely wish that the author and his brother ministers would take higher ground in their exhibition of Christian privilege, and seek to realise themselves, and urge their hearers to realise also, full assurance of faith, and joy in the Holy Ghost; yet we would rather that these sermons were in every house and scanned by every eye, than the works we have noticed in the former part of this article. Regeneration by the power of the Holy Spirit, is the watchword of the teachers of this school; and what so needed as this in an age of empty ceremony and philosophical deadness? Their converts may be few, and their progress slow, but the one must be genuine, and the other lasting. There is no danger of any one who reads these sermons, or hears them preached, substituting form for power, or of regarding a mere assent to Bible propositions as saving faith. And yet the system they pourtray is manifestly defective. The Spirit's range of operation is confined to the range of the Bible's existence; where the "word of salvation" is not, neither is there salvation itself. Thus all hope for the heathen is cut off. And yet the Bible itself gives us to see that *salvation* is possible even where *revelation* does not exist. They who have not the law are a law unto themselves. Even the visible things of creation reveal the power and Godhead of the Eternal, so that men who possess not the Word are left without excuse. And so generous and merciful is the Divine One, that whoso feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him. Cornelius was a saved man before Peter was sent to make known to him the gospel of the kingdom. These facts make it evident that salvation exists even

where the "word of it" is unknown; that while that word is only *somewhere*, the Holy Spirit is *everywhere*, giving a measure of light to every man who cometh into the world, thus making salvation from hell possible, where salvation into the peculiar and special glories of the "Body of Christ" is not attainable. We do not utter this dogmatically, but venture to state it as a subject for inquiry, that this hint may possibly do something towards solving the problem of eternal election by shewing that, while the Eternal Father has appointed no man unto wrath, but made his escape therefrom dependent upon his fidelity to the light which he causes to shine into his conscience, he has to the "Body, the Church," whose destiny it is to "make known to principalities and powers, in the ages to come, what is the exceeding riches of his grace to usward," reserved to himself the sovereign right of selection and appointment.

Beginning our criticism at the point at which Divine light enters a sinner's heart, we differ from Mr. Philpot only on one matter. Admitting that the work of conversion is in all cases begun by the Holy Spirit; that man is aroused or constrained to turn his attention to those things which make for his peace,—sometimes in a way resembling the thunder-storm, at others, like the gentle shower of a May-day,—without previous intimation having been given, or his consent sought, or desire consulted, yet in most cases the power is other than *invincible*. This is what Mr. P. will not admit. But it is true, nevertheless. Man is conscious that he may resist the Holy Ghost. We have all done so times without number. Often there is a long space between the entrance of light and feeling into the heart, and a state of reconciliation with God; and that time is mostly one of struggle, conflict, resistings and yieldings. In some cases resistance is continued. And though the Divine One waits long to be gracious; though he says, "hear my voice, and harden not your hearts;" though the visited one is urged to "yield himself to God," and though in the eleventh hour mercy is sometimes secured, yet in some cases the sinner holds out, grieves away the Spirit of God, and having hardened his heart through his resistance of many reproofs, he is "suddenly destroyed." In this lies our chief difference with Mr. Philpot. He claims for grace invincibility and ultimate conquest; observing, let a heart be but once visited by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost, and though years of folly and sin may succeed that one visit, the soul is certain of eternal life. This utterance may be the logical conclusion from eternal election premises, but we really know not in what part of the Bible we can look for a plain proof of such a sentiment; and we are furthermore strongly of opinion, that such a conclusion is the best refutation of the principles from which it is drawn. Doubtless there are instances of men being so

distressed, appalled, condemned, and crushed, by the workings of conviction, as from the first to have no wish but to secure the light and liberty of the children of God. From the first they are spoiled for the world and sin. The thought of returning to their old habits enters not their minds: to get peace with God and be holy is their fixed resolve. It is not so with others. They have terrible struggles with satan and sin. Though convinced like the former, they yet seem to be placed, so to speak, on their trial, to be left to choose between life and death, the blessed Spirit wooing and beseeching them to be reconciled unto God, to escape for their lives. Many, alas! go back. The morning cloud vanishes, the early dew evaporates. Hundreds can testify to the truth of this. And unless we admit the figment of *common* and *special* grace; calls which are purposely *abortive* and calls purposely *effectual*—a theory put forth by some Calvinian writers, but not met with, that we know of, in the sermons before us, nor in those of others of this class—then it is demonstrated that man has the terrible power invested in him of resisting to his damnation the gracious calls of the Spirit of God.

We have another fault to find with the theology of Mr. Philpot. Denying even saved man the least power of a spiritual kind; keeping him from first to last like clay in the hands of the potter; he makes it out that many are doomed to travel all the way from the cross to the crown, burdened with their guilt and depravity, sighing and groaning for hope, peace, and assurance, and only securing comfort when they appear before God in Zion! Others are made to carry their native corruptions with them to the grave, "dethroned," it is admitted, but not cast out, nor even lessened! How strange does the following description of Christian experience sound in Methodistic ears:—"He (the Christian) seems always working and counter-working, doing and undoing, fighting and yielding; raging with inward passions and softened with contrition; diving into all the pollution of a fallen nature, and rising up into the presence of a holy God; hating sin and loving it; longing after the vilest iniquities, and pained at an idle word; feeding upon the filthiest garbage, and eating manna; revelling in a train of past sins and abhorring himself as the vilest monster that crawls upon the earth. At times he feels earnestly desirous never to sin more, and would fain be as holy as an angel; at other times he feels as if the sins of thousands were pent up in his bosom, and as if his vile heart could lie down and wallow in all the abominations which have ever been conceived by the mind, uttered by the lips, or acted by the hand of man." (Vide "Heir of Heaven walking in darkness," pp. 28, 29.) This is a strange picture of a gracious heart to exhibit before a public audience, or to send from the press. Can it be true? Do any really gracious souls,

men regenerated and sealed by the Holy Spirit, feel as is here described? Can it be that one who is created anew in Christ Jesus *feeds* even in imagination (for it is heart-work that the preacher describes) on the filthiest garbage, and *revels* in a train of past sins? We believe it cannot be so with one who is filled with all the fulness of God, and who walks in the liberty of God's dear children. But we fear that few who sit under a ministry which deals in such teaching ever rise above what may properly be called a state of conviction; for, believing that they can do nothing whatever to promote growth in grace, designating the Methodistic use of the means, public and private, as "Arminian lumber," and waiting passively God's time to give them light and strength and liberty, it is no wonder they should remain the miserable victims of the carnal mind.

A sad use is made by this class of teachers of the seventh chapter of Romans. Overlooking the fact that Paul gives, in the first eight chapters of that Letter, a perfect and connected history of redemption—both of "price and power;" beginning with man's helplessness, legal and moral; going to the enlightening and quickening process, as described in the seventh chapter, and culminating with the soul's exultation in its attainment of deliverance, peace, purity, protection, and eternal life, as set forth in the eighth; the said seventh chapter is made into a description of Christian experience *all through life;* and the child of grace is called upon to regard himself as a veritable Christian only when his experience resembles that therein described. Would that his attention were drawn more to the eighth chapter than to the seventh! We have no personal knowledge of Mr. Philpot, nor of the churches to which he ministers; but we are bold enough to affirm that both he and his churches would be happier and more useful Christians did they but see that "strengthened by Christ they could do all things;" that it is their privilege to walk in newness of life, being filled with all joy and peace through believing; and that, being rooted and grounded in love, they might be saved from all the filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord. We can easily conceive of one who is renewed in the spirit of his mind, a new creature in Christ Jesus, and having a heavenly mind, being plagued and pestered with the body of sin and death which, in this life, he inhabits; and having every form of evil and impurity presented to his view, and pressed upon his acceptance by the *enemy without him*, thus being in heaviness through manifold temptations for a season; but that the *mind* can be at once carnal and spiritual, holy and unholy, loving and hating sin, is a creed we have no means of understanding, nor have we any particular wish to be able to do so. Glad we are that we know something about being

dead indeed unto sin and alive unto God; and from experience we know how faith, hope, patience, and every other attribute of the new man, can be *tried* without making it needful that we must have seasons in which we feel as if all the sins that ever were conceived by the mind, uttered by the lips, and acted in the life of man, could be *wallowed in.*

Except on these two points, the resistibility of the Holy Ghost and the existence of the carnal mind in the regenerated, there is no difference between the experimental theology of Wesley and of Philpot. Both men are widely removed from the theology of Mr. Kirk. Both men place salvation in the hands of the Holy Spirit, regard the action of that Spirit on the mind and heart as of essential importance; make believing with the heart the only believing that can bring after it or along with it the blessing of the Lord; define repentance as the yearnings, sighings, groanings, relentings, upbraidings, and consecrations of a quickened soul; make christian experience the only true index to the reality of faith and to the soul's standing before God: both reprobate the rationalistic sentiment that sanctification is keeping the ten commandments, and regard it as partaking of the Divine nature, just as the branch participates the nature of the vine into which it is grafted. Arminius and Calvin were not so far apart as many modern preachers seem to believe: they were at a point on what constitutes true religion, and on the agency of the Holy Ghost. On these points, which are the only vital ones in the controversy, Wesley and Philpot are agreed; and there is not a Methodist preacher in the land—except he be false to the creed of his church—who does not affirm the positive depravity and guilt of the human heart, the need of the quickening power of the Holy Spirit, and its witnessing, comforting, upholding, and guiding agency, through the sorrows, dangers, and sins of this life. Mr. Philpot's discourses, abounding with sentiments in harmony with these views, cannot fail to warm, and melt, and comfort, the devout Methodist reader. We ourselves owe Mr. P. a debt of gratitude. We have in reading them got many a lucious grape from the vines of Eschol; many a draught of cooling water from the wells in Baca; and basking in the beams of a glorified Christ, as delineated by his pen, we have exclaimed—"It is good to be here." With one extract, shewing the ease and fluency of his style, and the rich piety of his sentiments, we close our criticism and our article: —"The faith of which I have been speaking never perishes like gold. The hottest flame cannot destroy it, nor does it perish by use, for the more it is used the stronger it is, nor does it perish at death, though then it is turned into sight. If faith could fail then, all must fail, for the life which we live in the flesh we live by the faith of the Son of God; so, could the faith fail, the life would

fail also, and the loss of life would be the loss of the soul. By faith we come to God, by faith we believe the promises, receive the truth, embrace his salvation in and by the Son of his love. By faith we stand, by faith we walk, by faith we fight, by faith we overcome; so that if faith could fail there would be no standing in the truth, no walking with God, no fighting the good fight, and in the end no victory. * * * At the glorious appearing of the Son of God a second time without sin unto salvation, our faith, if, indeed, it be the gift and grace of God, and is a faith which has stood every storm, every trial, and passed uninjured through every furnace, will be found unto praise and honour and glory. * * * Is there not a glorious crown in view, and shall we not press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus? Is it not far better for you to be a poor, despised, afflicted, tempted saint of God, with the faith of God's elect in your heart, and the kingdom of grace in your breast, pressing and struggling on through a sea of difficulties to reach the heavenly shore, and to take possession of this glorious inheritance, than enjoy all that the world could lay at your feet? O how far richer does such a faith make us than if worlds were ours. Broad lands, ample fields, beautiful gardens, noble houses, and a splendid income, all that money can give or the heart can desire, what are they all compared with this glorious inheritance; and any testimony, however feeble, if it be but real, of a manifested interest in it?"—Vide, *The Precious Trial of Faith*, pp. 22-4.

J. S.

ART. IV.—ETERNITY OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.*

IN every age thinking men have been anxious to ascertain the knowledge of their future existence. This solicitude is manifested in the purest and noblest conceptions of the most distinguished sages of antiquity. The Father of mercies has graciously sympathised with this deep felt want of his offspring, and has given them a revelation of the world to come. He has told them that their future well-being or ill-being depends on their present conduct.

* Substance of an Essay read at Darlaston, in April, 1867, at the Second Session of the Literary Association of the Tunstall District.

If they live righteously on the earth, in heaven they shall enjoy "an eternal weight of glory;" but if here they commit sin, do evil, work iniquity, hereafter they shall be doomed to suffer an eternal weight of woe and punishment. These solemn disclosures on a question of supreme moment, as our eternal destiny indisputably is, must certainly be of the highest interest and importance to every sober-minded man.

The mental and moral phenomena of man constitute sufficient data upon which we might argue, *a priori*, his immortality, his responsibility, and the never ending consequences of obedience or disobedience to the Divine will. But our business now is to inquire whether the Scriptures assign to the finally impenitent an eternity of punishment.

The definition generally given of the term eternity or *æternitas* is, space or time always or for ever continuing. Eternity absolutely and properly signifies duration without beginning and without end. "Eternity," "eternal," "everlasting," and "ever-and-ever," are synonymous words, and are used interchangeably. *Olam* in the Hebrew, and *aion* in the Greek, are the words in these languages which denote eternity. Dr. A. Clarke in his comment on "*The everlasting God*," says: "We learn that *olam* and *aion* originally signified eternal, or duration without end. *Olam* signifies he [God] was hidden, concealed, kept secret; and *aion* according to Aristotle, (and a higher authority need not be sought,) is a compound of *aei*, always, and *on*, being. The same author informs us that God was termed *aia*, because he was always existing. Hence we see that no words can more forcibly express the grand characteristics of eternity than these. It is that duration which is concealed, hidden, or kept secret, from all created beings; which is always still running on, but never running out; an interminable, incessant, and immeasurable duration; it is that in the whole of which God alone can be said to exist; and that which the eternal mind can alone comprehend." *Olam* and *aion* are not only used by the sacred writers in the original and absolute sense, but also in an accommodated sense. When applied to any created thing they have a restricted meaning; for no creature can be eternal in the same sense as the Creator. The existence of God is endless both in the past and future; but the existence of all created beings, that are said to be eternal, is not without beginning, it is only without end; their eternity is not absolute. The Lord is from everlasting to everlasting; but angelic and human spirits are not from everlasting, they are only to everlasting; they partake of the everlastingness of their Creator in the future, not in the past. When "ever" or "everlasting" is applied to Jewish rites, the promised land, mountains, the earth, and such like things, they are evidently used in a figurative sense, and denote a long time or an indefinite

period. When "eternal," "everlasting," and "ever-and-ever" are applied either to the future rewards of the just, or the punishment of the wicked, they convey, as we shall proceed to prove, the idea of the longest possible duration; they signify endlessness in the strictest sense; perpetuity without termination, or interruption, or cessation.

Sacred history furnishes us with many punitive events illustrative and confirmatory of the doctrine of future punishment. The apostate angels who "kept not their first state," were probably placed in a state of probation similar to Adam in Paradise. Be that as it may, they sinned, they proved faithless and disloyal to their Creator, they revolted against him, broke his law, the law of their own well-being. Therefore the Lord doomed them to a place of everlasting fire, where they are reserved until the judgment of the last day. Matt. xxv. 41; Jude 6; Rev. xx. 10. The effects of human apostacy are as eternal as those of angelic apostacy. By sin Adam for ever lost Paradise with all its blessedness. He was precluded from the tree of life; he was driven out of the garden of Eden to till the ground, and by the sweat of his face, and in sorrow to eat his bread, until he returned to the dust, from whence he was taken. The direful transformation which the first transgression produced in the primal condition of man is felt and suffered to this day, and will be in the sorrowful "conception" and troublesome life of the last born of the human race. The history of fallen humanity and of its redemption by Christ Jesus, shows that not anything but Divine mercy and grace can remedy the evils of sin and prevent them from travelling onward eternally. And if these be not sought for, or if rejected when offered, the non-seekers or rejectors must inevitably remain under the curse and condemnation of sin for ever. Gen. iii. 14, 24; Rom. v. 12; Mark xvi. 16; Heb. x. 26, 31. The apostle Jude tells us that Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Jude 7. By a bold personification the inhabitants of the cities are meant. They, like the fallen angels, were doomed to eternal retribution. Thus they became an example of that vengeance that will befall the wicked in a future state.

In the reign of king Hezekiah, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, invaded Judea with a vast army. The pious Jews in Jerusalem called upon the Lord to save them from their approaching foe. The Lord answered their prayers and destroyed the Assyrians. Then Hezekiah and all that trusted in the Lord rejoiced in him, and celebrated his greatness. But when those wicked and hypocritical Jews in Jerusalem saw the almighty power of Jehovah displayed in the destruction of the wicked Assyrians, it

produced in them the highest fear and terror, and in their alarm they exclaimed, "Who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings"? Isa. xxxiii. 14. These frightened sinners and hypocrites knew that they were the enemies of God and his people (though secret) as the Assyrians were, and when they saw the terrible effect of his wrath manifested against the wicked in one night, it awakened in their minds the popular sentiment and belief of the eternal fires and burnings of future retribution; and they trembled at the thought of enduring such burning wrath for ever.

Isaiah and Christ employed the *Gehenna of fire*—hell-fire—as a very striking symbol of future punishment. On the south-east of Jerusalem is a valley that was called Hinnom. This valley became noted from the idolatrous worship, which it is said Solomon instituted there, to Molech and Chemosh; and which was afterwards practiced by several of the kings of Judah. Molech was a monster brass idol. The infatuated people were wont to heat him red-hot, and then throw their children alive into his arms, where they were consumed. In order to drown their piteous cries and heart-rending shrieks, they made a great noise around the idol with drums and other instruments. These drumings were called *Toph*, hence the valley was often called Tophet. Jer. vii. 31, 32. When Josiah came to the throne of Judah he abolished these barbarous practices, and turned the valley into the recepticle of all the refuse and dead bodies of the city. The corpses that were thrown into it putrified, and bred worms, and exhaled pestilential vapours. Fires were kept continually burning around the valley to consume the noxious effluvium, and to prevent its impregnating the atmosphere of the city and the country with its poisonous and deadly elements. Hence these fires that were always burning, and the worms that were ceaselessly gnawing, were very sensible and impressive images of the unending torments and miseries of the wicked in hell. Isaiah concludes his sublime prophecies with this appalling announcement: "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Isa. lvi. 24. Christ applied this language to the punishment of the wicked in "hell." Hell-fire, said he, "*never shall be quenched.*" "*Where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*" Mark ix. 43-48.

The programme of the future and ultimate destiny of the impenitent may be traced on the sacred pages. Here we read of "the death of the wicked"—"ye shall die in your sins;" and they who die in their sins shall be raised from the dead in their sins; for "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust;" and they that are raised from the dead in their

sins shall come to judgment in their sins: for "we shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ;" and Christ their Judge will say unto them, "Depart from me ye cursed, into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels."

The Scriptures teach the eternity of punishment in very clear, decisive, and unmistakeable language. John the Baptist told the Pharisees and Sadducees that "He who cometh after me, whose fan is in his hand, will throughly purge his floor and gather the wheat into his garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matt. iii. 12; Luke iii. 17. The Saviour said to his disciple John, "And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched*, where the worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*." Mark ix. 43, 44. In these two and the four following verses, five times over Christ emphatically declared that hell-fire shall never be extinguished, and that the worm, whatever it may be, shall not die. The apostle Paul, in language equally as explicit, declared, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The other inspired teachers perfectly accord with the Baptist, Christ, and Paul. From the preceding averments, we conclude that the punishment of the wicked in hell will be eternal.

The citation of two or three texts in juxtaposition will exhibit the striking analogy between the eternity of God and that of future punishment:—

"The *everlasting* God." Isa. xl. 28.	"Depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting* punishment." Matt. xxv. 41.
"Thy throne, O God, is for *ever* and *ever*." Heb. i. 8.	"And the smoke of their torments ascendeth up for *ever* and *ever*." Rev. xiv. 11.

Here we see that the very same terms positively assert alike the eternity of God and the eternity of hell torments. As we have before remarked, we do not think that these passages teach that the creature is eternal in the same absolute sense as the Creator; neither the eternal blessedness of the saved, nor the eternal misery of the lost, is perfectly parallel with the eternity of God; but, though they are not parallel retrospectively, yet from the analogy expressed between them, they are undoubtedly parallel prospectively.

We observe a striking antithesis between the duration of the

future glory of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked. The prophet Daniel in foretelling the general resurrection of the dead, asserts the purpose for which they shall be raised: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii. 2. Here the term "everlasting," rendered either from the Hebrew *olam*, or the Greek *aionion*, is applied both to the life of the one, and the contempt of the other; so that if the former shall enjoy never ending life, the latter shall suffer never ending shame and contempt. Christ concluded his description of the last judgment with the following asseveration: "These shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal*." Matt. xxv. 46. Thus we see that the awards of both the good and bad are alike eternal. The punishment of the cursed is *aionion*, everlasting; and the rewards of the blessed is *aionion*, everlasting. "In regard to the meaning of the word everlasting," says Barnes, "in this place, it is to be observed: 1st. That the literal meaning of the word expresses absolute eternity—*always being*. Matt. xviii. 18; xix. 16; Mark iii. 29; Rom. ii. 7; Heb. v. 9. 2nd. That the obvious, plain interpretation of the word demands this signification. 3rd. That admitting that this was the Saviour's design, ever to teach this doctrine, this would be *the very word* to express it; and if this does not teach it, *it cannot* be taught. 4th. That it is not taught in any plainer manner in any confession of faith on the globe; and if this may be explained, all those may be. 5th. That our Saviour knew that this would be understood by nine-tenths of the world; and if he did *not* mean to teach it, he has knowingly led them into error, and his honesty cannot be vindicated. 6th. That he knew the doctrine was calculated to produce *fear* and *terror;* and if he was benevolent, his conduct cannot be vindicated in exciting unnecessary fear. 7th. *That the word used here is the same in the original as that used to express the eternal life of the righteous*, if the one can be proved to be limited in duration, the other can by the *same argument. The proof that the righteous will be happy for ever is precisely the same, and no other, than that the wicked will be miserable for ever.*"

We find the phrase,—"ever and ever," applied both to the rewards of heaven and the punishments of hell. In Daniel we read:—"They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Dan. xii. 3. In Revelations we read:—"And the devil that deceived them was cast alive into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophets are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Rev. xx. 10. As there is no qualifying term, in either text, to denote limitation, we take it

for granted that "ever and ever," in both instances, must mean to all eternity. "This phrase," ever and ever, "is used," says Dr. Dwight, "if I mistake not, eighteen times in the New Testament. In fifteen instances it is applied to the continuance of the glory, perfections, government, and praise of God. Once to the righteous in the kingdom of heaven, 'They shall reign for ever and ever.' Rev. xxii. 5. In the other two it is applied to the torments of the lost in hell. Rev. xiv. 11; xx. 10. Now let me ask whether a man, even of moderate understanding, could be supposed to write with scrupulous integrity a system of theology, and employ this phrase sixteen times to denote an absolute eternity, and twice to denote that which is infinitely different; while these were the only instances in which the phrase was applied to a given subject, and that of immeasurable importance to those for whom he wrote? But if such a man cannot be supposed thus to use language, nor vindicate it when used in this manner, can such conduct be safely attributed to the Spirit of God?"

Again we read of "Eternal Salvation." Heb. v. 9; and of "Eternal damnation." Mark iii. 29. Thus we see that salvation and damnation, in the abstract are alike *eternal.* Then it undeniably follows, that those who become the subjects of either one or the other, shall be either eternally saved or eternally damned.

We might avail ourselves of the aid of the history of doctrine to show that the Scriptures we have adduced in proof of this doctrine, have been generally understood and regarded both by Jews and Christian to teach the eternity of hell punishments, and thus show that it is not a crotchet of some eccentric theologian, nor a dogma of a singular sect; but the universal belief of those who receive the Bible in its entirety and integrity. And we could further strengthen and confirm this doctrine by answering objections to it; and by exhibiting the absurdity of opposite views. But our space being about occupied, we defer doing so for another occasion, if it should ever arise; or we commend it to abler hands. But here we may remark, that the doctrine of eternal punishment cannot be gainsaid or discarded, except by blinking the plainest facts of man's spiritual and moral being; and by distorting and racking the plainest and most precise assertions of God's Word—that is on broad neological and sceptical grounds. If any doctrine of revelation is credible, that of eternal punishment is; because there is not any doctrine substantiated by more convincing and irrefragable evidence.

But why preach the doctrine of eternal punishment? Why? Because it is clearly and fully revealed in the Holy Scriptures. It is interwoven with all the other truths of the Bible; and if this is left out of your ministry, then you do not preach all the truths of the Book, and that ministry which fails to include every revealed

truth, is so far a crippled ministry—lacking in completeness and force. Do you ask "what good will the preaching of the terrible doctrine of eternal retribution produce? It may startle and alarm but it can never save?" Even so, but are there not tens of thousands of dead and careless sinners that will never be saved unless they are startled and alarmed by announcements of the wrath which is coming upon the ungodly? We know of many good Christians who were first aroused and awakened by the threatenings and terrors of the Lord. If the curses which the Bible denounces against sin did not save them, they stirred them up to seek the Lord's mercy, and to grasp by faith the promises of the Gospel. What is the use of offering salvation to men before they are aroused to a consciousness of their danger? Ought we not first to warn the wicked from the Lord; then promise them salvation in his name? Some pretend they cannot preach about the torments of hell! If they cannot it may be questioned whether they ought to preach at all? Was not the gracious Saviour an awful messenger of doom? Are they who cannot speak of the undying worm and of the unquenchable fire more tender, merciful, and benevolent than Christ? Some try to excuse themselves from preaching this awful doctrine by saying that it is not preaching Christ. But if the doctrine of eternal punishment is not Christ; it forms an integral and important part of the Christian Scriptures, and it is not within the province of any one to suppress any portion of God's truth. We admit with Paley, "That it is very difficult to handle this dreadful subject properly; and one cause, amongst others, of the difficulty is, that it is not for one poor sinner to denounce such appalling terrors, such tremendous consequences against another." Yet with him we maintain that it is "absolutely necessary that the threatenings of Almighty God be known and published."

L. W.

ART. V.—THE PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF ALCOHOL.

HAVING been much struck with the increased facilities afforded to the public by the licensing of small shop-keepers and grocers to sell intoxicating liquors, the writer deemed it to be a fit time to bring before thoughtful and Christian minds the injurious effect of these liquors upon the human system. Not a few of the members and office bearers of our churches are engaged directly or indirectly in the liquor traffic, and are habitually dispensing this most potent evil. To them we would address the words of Dr. Nott:—"Brethren,—inn-keepers, wine-vendors,—has it never occurred to your minds, that the liquors dispensed were destined, unseen by you, to blanche some glow of health, to wither some blossoms of hope, to disturb some asylum of peace, to pollute some sanctuary of innocence, or plant gratuitous, perhaps enduring misery in some bosom of joy? Have you never in imagination followed the wretched inebriate, whose glass you have poured out, or whose jug or bottle you have filled? Have you never followed him to his unblessed and comfortless abode? Have you never mentally witnessed the wistful look and stifled cry of his terror-stricken children, waiting at night-fall his dreaded return? Have you never in thought marked his rude entrance, his ferocious look, his savage yell, and that demoniac frenzy under the influence of which he drove both wife and children forth, exposed to the wintry blast and the pelting of the pitiless storm, or denying them even this refuge, how he has smitten them both to the earth beneath his murderous arms?" We would ask, is this a Christian work, to sell that which has caused so many brethren to stumble? The fearful results of the use of alcoholic liquors are confined to no class, the learned and illiterate alike fall into its snare. Neither the divine in the pulpit, the lawyer at the bar, nor the doctor with his patients, can be certain that some day or other he will not make shipwreck of a good character, and be brought at last to a drunkard's grave.

It is the object of this paper to deal rather with the physical than the moral effects of alcohol, and to prove that so far from being nutritous it is positively injurious to persons in health.

When alcohol is taken into the system every organ seeks to get rid of it as soon as possible. It has no share in that assimilation to the blood which other articles of food possess, since it is not in any quantity capable of being mixed with the blood. "It is nowhere found in nature. If we search throughout the wide range of vegetative and animated forms, there is not one plant or flower, not one

creature or compound resulting from the formative processes of life and growth in which it can possibly be detected or developed, but when found in contact is destructive to both." When food is taken into the stomach it is there reduced to a pultaceous mass by the action of the gastric juice and the muscular walls of the stomach. The gastric juice consists of hydrochloric, and holds a peculiar ferment called pepsine in solution. On the introduction of alcohol part of the pepsine is precipitated and congulated by its action, thus hindering the process of digestion; in fact, if it were not that wine and spirits are very rapidly absorbed, their introduction in any quantity would form a complete bar to digestion.

Dr. Beaumont had the singular privilege of looking into the healthy stomach of a young man named St. Martin, who had a part of the skin, muscles, and ribs of the left side of the body blown away by a gun shot wound, which laid open the stomach, leaving a permanent opening into it. Through this opening the doctor introduced various kinds of food, and withdrew from time to time the gastric secretion, and also the aliments in their different stages of digestion. The man was generally healthy and temperate, but Dr. Beaumont tells us under the date July 28th, 1833, "That the stomach is not healthy, some erythema and apthous patches on the mucous surface. St. Martin has been drinking ardent spirits pretty freely, for the eight or ten days past, complains of no pain, nor shows symptoms of general indisposition, says he feels well and has a good appetite. August 1st; inner membrane of the stomach morbid; considerable erythema, and some apthous patches on the exposed surface; secretions vitiated. August 3rd; inner membrane of the stomach unusually morbid, the erythematous appearances more extensive, and spots more livid than usual, from the surface of which exceeded small drops of grumous blood; the apthous patches larger and more numerous, the mucous covering thicker than common, and the secretions much more vitiated. The gastric fluids extracted this morning were mixed with a large proportion of thick, ropy mucus, and considerable muco purlent matter, slightly tinged with blood, resembling the discharge from the bowels in some cases of chronic dysentery. St. Martin complains of no sympathy indicating any general derangement of the system, except an uneasy sensation at the pit of the stomach, and some vertigo, with dimness and yellowness of vision on stooping down and rising again; has a thin yellowish brown coat on his tongue, and his countenance rather yellow, pulse uniform and regular, appetite good, rests quietly, and sleeps as well as usual. By the 6th of August the inner surface of the stomach had recovered its healthy

appearance; the patient having in the meantime entirely abstained from alcoholic liquors, and having been confined to low diet."

In cases of continual indulgence in alcoholic drinks patches of effused blood are found distributed over the mucous membrane of the stomach. Its walls become considerably thickened, and ultimately so damaged and hard that it can no longer exercise its proper functions.

In the annexed table the result of experiments performed by Dr. Munroe will be seen to verify the statements as to the fallacy of alcohol assisting the process of digestion:—

Finely Minced Beef.	2nd Hour.	4th Hour.	6th Hour.	8th Hour.	10th Hour.
I. Gastric-juice *and Water.*	Beef became opaque.	Digesting and separating.	Beef much lessened.	Broken-up into shreds.	Dissolved like soup.
II. Gastric-juice *and Alcohol.*	No alteration perceptible.	Slightly opaque; but beef unchanged.	Slight coating on beef.	No visible change.	Beef solid; on cooling, pepsine precipitated.
III. Gastric-juice *and Pale Ale.*	No change.	Cloudy, with fur on beef.	Beef partly loosened.	No further change.	No digestion; on cooling, pepsine precipitated.

Liver.—The liver is the next organ that suffers and attracts a great proportion of the poisonous fluid. The opening through which the vessels enter this organ is surrounded by areolar tissue; this becomes the seat of chronic inflammation, matter is thrown out, becomes slowly organised into contractile fibrous tissue, and thus presses on and reduces the calibre of the branches of the portal vein, as well as the hepatic artery and vein. In consequence of this pressure the proper structure of the liver wastes, becomes pale and contracted, the surface is drawn in at some parts, which gives it the peculiar feel and appearance of the drunkard's hob-nailed liver. The cells waste and have no longer power to convert the starch, sugar, and gum, into the natural fluid bile. The veins leading to the liver thus become so congested as to lead to dropsy.

There is also another change to which the liver is liable, viz.—enlargement. This is due not to an increased growth of its proper substance, but to an accumulation of fatty matter. Dr. Peters of New York remarks, that "in *moderate* drinkers the liver was generally found to be larger than usual, its texture softened, its

outer surface spotted with patches of fatty infiltration, the rest of the viscus retaining its natural colour, and its edges their nominal sharpness.

Kidneys.—The kidneys become the seat of chronic inflammation, hence results alteration in their structure, as well as impairment of their functions. This change very closely resembles the degenerated condition of the liver already described. This is often followed by the subcutaneous tissues of the face and limbs filling with water, and also the cavities of the chest and abdomen.

Skin.—Dr. Carpenter, F.R.S., tells us that "the ingestion of alcoholic liquors has a tendency to produce various disorders in its nutrition, chiefly those resulting from congestion or inflammation of its several tissues. Such disorders show themselves especially on the skin of the face, and these for two reasons; in the first place, because the face partakes of the general determination of blood towards the head, so that it becomes more flushed than any other part of the surface, and also because the exposure of this part of the cutaneous surface disposes it to be more affected than that of the body and limbs by external cold, which will always tend by lowering the vital activity of any tissue and increase the evils resulting from too copious a determination of blood towards it. Hence we find the skin of the face especially disposed to exhibit those carbuncles, boils, &c., which may be considered in a large proportion of cases as the direct results of habitual intemperance; it is also the part in which the erysipelatous attacks, so common among the intemperate, most frequently commence, when they are not immediately excited by some injury elsewhere. Certain other diseases of the skin seem to be rather consequent upon the disorder of the digestive apparatus, induced by the habitual free use of alcoholic liquors, than due to the direct agency of the alcohol upon its tissues."

Blood.—The blood consists of a yellowish liquid called liquor sanguinio, which is formed of serum, holding fibrine in solution, and in which are contained numerous red discs, called blood corpuscles, together with a few larger colourless corpuscles. In the case of a drunkard the blood becomes charged with unchanged and unused material, and contains at least thirty per cent. more carbon than in the normal state. The corpuscles become altered in shape and throw out matter from their interior. There is an increased and unnatural contraction which hurries them on to the last stage of development, and thus induces premature decay and death. Dr. Bocker found in his experiments that "the alteration undergone by the blood of the habitual drinker as yet in good health, viz., a partial loss of power to become red by exposure to the air, in consequence of a loss of vitality in a portion of the blood disc, was due to the alcohol acting as a solvent of the

colouring matter of the blood." This loss of vitality manifests itself by the formation of black specs (oil) in the discs, and then by their conversion into the round pale globules, which in all cases of disease are found in excess in the blood.

Heart.—The muscular walls of the heart become thickened, not only by the increased action caused by the irritation of the alcoholised blood, but also by the increased power being required to propel a fluid thus loaded with unchanged and unused material through the body. We have it on the authority of Dr. Latham that in a multitude of cases where the lining membranes of the heart has been beset with cartilaginous, atheromatous, or earthy deposits, the patients have been habitual spirit drinkers for years, and the most conspicuous conditions antecedently presented by them, have been the failure of many functions and the growth of structural disease in many organs, especially those subservient to nutrition. This increased action of the heart tends to shorten life. An ingenious author made the following calculation: "If you allow 70 years for the usual age of man, and 60 pulsations per minute, the number of pulsations for his whole life would be 2,207,520,000. If by intemperance he forces his blood into more rapid motion, so as to give 75 pulsations per minute, the same number of pulsations would be completed in 56 years. His life would thus be reduced 14 years. Those therefore whose pulse is always quick, and in whom every trifling agitation of mind or every additional drop of wine increases the motion of the heart, are unfortunate candidates for longevity, since their whole life is a continued fever."

Brain.—The brain is the organ most affected by alcoholic drinks. If in the blood it is represented as 1.0; in the brain it is 1.34, and in the loin 1.48.

Dr. Munroe, F.L.S., in his admirable lecture on the physiological action of alcohol, says:—"For the sake of elucidation, let me remark that the brain is divided into (i.) the *Cerebrum*, or brain proper, composed of many convolutions of grey matter, with which man perceives, remembers, judges, wills, and dictates movements; (ii.) the *Sensorium*, which is a mass of white vesicular nerve-substance, situated beneath the cerebrum, or upper brain. Its particular office is to register all the impressions received from the special organs of sense,—the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and skin. Beneath the sensorium, and posteriorly, is the *Cerebellum*, which regulates and equilibrates locomotion; and inferior to this, comes the *Medulla Oblongata*, which excites and directs respiration. It may thus be seen, that all creatures having a cerebrum are capable of performing some kind of intellectual operation.

"Habits of intoxication, or the continued use of alcoholic drinks short of this stage, as shown on post-mortem examination of the

brain, produce a congested condition of its capillary vessels, indicating an amount of pressure upon its substance which materially interferes with its healthy function. This congestion of the minute vessels of the brain, which on cutting through its substance is revealed as minute bloodspots, often gives rise to epilepsy and apoplexy.

"The quality of the blood becoming impaired by the habitual use of intoxicating beverages, is no longer able to sustain the brain in a healthy condition; and beneath the *pia mater*, a membrane surrounding the convolutions of the brain, is nearly always found an effusion of a milky white fluid, indicative of congestion and stimulation, which accounts in some measure for the mental incapacity and other disorders of the drunkard."

Dr. Lees tells us, "That while alcohol has a peculiar affinity for the brain, its action is more immediately and directly felt on those parts of the sympathetic and organic system most intimately connected with the animal propensities, and at the same time, by the law of stimulants, wasting or diminishing the vital force required for the normal action of the organs of the higher nature."

The effect of alcohol upon the brain and nervous system, is sufficiently evidenced in every day life—disturbing their functions and perverting their nutrition. Space will not permit of our dwelling upon the diseases thus induced, but with regard to one of them, viz., *delirium tremens*, we cannot do better than give the description of one who has himself gone through it:—"For three days I endured more agony than pen could describe, even were it guided by the hand of a Dante. Who can tell the horrors of that horrible malady, aggravated as it is by the almost ever-biding consciousness that it is self-sought? Hideous faces appeared on the walls, and on the ceiling, and on the floors, foul things crept along the bed clothes, and glaring eyes pierced into mine. I was at one time surrounded by millions of monstrous spiders, who crawled slowly—slowly over every limb, whilst beaded drops of perspiration would start to my brow, and my limbs would shiver until the bed rattled again. Strange lights would dance before my eyes, and then suddenly the very blackness of darkness would appal me by its dense gloom. All at once, while gazing at a frightful creation of my distempered mind, I seemed struck with blindness. I knew a candle was burning in my room—but I could not see it. All was so pitchy dark. I lost the sense of feeling, too, for I endeavoured to grasp my arm in one hand, but consciousness was gone. I put my hand to my side, my head, but felt nothing, and still I knew my limbs and frame were there. And then the scene would change. I was falling—falling swiftly, as an arrow *far down into* some terrible abyss; and so like reality was it, that

as I fell I could see the rocky sides of the horrible shaft where mocking, gibing, mowing fiend-like forms, were perched; and I could feel the air rushing past me, making my hair stream out by the force of the unwholesome blast. Then the paroxysm sometimes ceased for a few moments, and I would sink back on my pallet drenched with perspiration, utterly exhausted and feeling a dreadful certainty of the renewal of my torments."

This disease is not brought on, as is commonly supposed, by the withdrawal of stimulants, but is the effect of a recent debauch acting upon the weakened brain of the drunkard. This statement is supported by the information of Mr. Smith, the governor of one of our jails, that out of 150,000 criminals who had passed through his hands—many of whom had been great drinkers, and whose liquor was cut off when they crossed the jail door, not one case of injury had occurred by the drink being taken from the person at once.

Insanity.—Respecting insanity, Dr. Crawford, of the Richmond Lunatic Asylum, in the year 1830, states that the number of patients then in confinement was 286, viz.: 120 males and 166 females. Of these there were no less than 115 whose illness was known with perfect certainty, from the *acknowledgment* of their relatives and friends, to have been occasioned by drinking whiskey; *fifty-eight* of whom are males, and *fifty-seven* females. "There is no doubt whatever," says Dr. Crawford, "that a great many more might be added to the same number, as is evident by the general appearance of many, and the character of their disease, although positive information concerning their habits of life cannot always be obtained,—the relatives being unwilling, from a sense of shame, to admit that they were intemperate. They often evince a singular degree of moral perversion on that subject, confidently asserting that the unfortunate sufferer was a *model of temperance*, when on closer inquiry it will frequently appear, that he was in the habit of taking many glasses of intoxicating liquor in the day, but was *notwithstanding*, *considered perfectly sober*, because he was not seen to *stagger* and *fall*. I feel confident," adds Dr. Crawford, "that I am keeping within the strict bounds of truth in stating, that at least one out of two of the patients now in the Asylum, have become insane in consequence of the use of ardent spirits; and I know that the same has been observed in the other public Lunatic Asylums in Ireland." "One class labour under various forms of *melancholy*, *partial hallucinations*, *impaired mental powers*, *loss of memory*, *complete fatuity*, *delirium tremens*, *and various forms of paralysis*. Those thus affected are habitual tipplers, who have long indulged in the habit of taking ardent spirits in sufficient quantity to keep up a moderate degree of excitement, but seldom, perhaps, if ever, succeeding so as to produce

actual intoxication. This is probably the most dangerous mode of drinking, and also the most common. People encourage themselves in it by applying as a *quietus* to their reproving conscience, the deceitful excuse, that they stop short of getting drunk. They thus go on, requiring, as they proceed, a gradually increasing quantity of liquor to keep up the delusive enjoyment; their short intervals of abstinence from drink are attended with intolerable feelings of distress, despondency, and remorse, until at last they are reduced, often in the prime of life, to the degrading condition of drivelling besotted imbeciles, with constitutions broken down by a variety of hopeless and loathsome complaints. *There is seldom an instance of recovery from any of the forms of insanity produced in this manner.*"

Dr. Hood of Bethleham Hospital sets forth in their tables that 90 out of 212 men, and 40 out of 359 women, afflicted with insanity, had been subjects of intemperance.

Nor does the matter end here, but as Dr. Brown in his essay on hereditary insanity tells us, "The drunkard not only injures and enfeebles his own nervous system, but entails mental disease upon his family. His daughters are nervous and hysterical, his sons are weak, wayward, eccentric, and sink insane under the pressure of excitement of some unforseen exigency, or of the ordinary calls of duty. This heritage may be the result of a ruined and diseased constitution, but is much more likely to proceed from that long continued nervous excitement in which pleasure was sought in the alternate exaltation of sentiment and oblivion, which exhausted and wore out the mental powers, and ultimately produced imbecility and paralysis, both attributable to disease of the substance of the brain."

Out of 300 idiots, 145 are reported as the children of habitual drunkards. It is a well-known fact amongst medical men, that confirmed drinkers have only a very poor chance of recovery from almost any serious disease or injury—this is especially the case in fevers and other inflammatory disorders.

With regard to severe injuries, it is frequently necessary to amputate the injured limb in order to give the patient the remotest chance of life. Dr. Carpenter, in speaking of London coal-heavers, ballasters, and draymen—who take their two or three gallons of porter daily, and even much spirits besides—remarks, that "when such men suffer from inflammatory attacks, or from local injuries, they are peculiarly disposed to run on to a fatal termination; in consequence, it is evident, of the deficient plasticity of the blood, of the low assimilative power of the solids, and of the general depression of the whole vital energy, resulting from habitual over excitement. The want of plasticity of the blood gives to the inflammatory processes an *asthenic* instead of a

sthenic character (that is, a character of weakness rather than strength); there is no limitation of their products by plastic effusion, as happens in the formation of an ordinary abcess, but they spread far and wide through the tissues; reducing treatment cannot be borne; and the only hope of success lies in the use of opium and stimulents with nutritious diet to sustain (so far as possible) the prostrated energy. Thus we see that in these men the slightest scratch or bruise will not unfrequently give rise to a fatal attack of erysipelas, and that internal organs affected with inflammation rapidly become infiltrated with pus, or pass into a gangrenous state."

In one of "Chamber's Tracts" we read, "that forty or fifty years ago there flourished a London drayman of huge proportions, a regular beer-bibber, known as Big Ben. Ben was reckoned one of the strongest men within the bills of mortality, and he occasionally was seen showing off as second in those prize boxing matches which used to delight our moral and intelligent ancestors. When stripped of his upper garments, and engaged in the attitudes of this brutalising sport, seldom or ever had there been seen a frame so robust, or one that promised better to endure the shocks that might assail it. 'There stands,' you would have said, an invulnerable giant, death will certainly find it no easy matter to level him.' Yet for all this apparent strength Ben was brought down by an injury which would not have scathed a child. One day his hand received a slight graze from the wheels of a passing carriage in the crowded streets—the skin was only ruffled. Ben wiped away the starting blood, but thought no more of the matter —in one week after Ben was in his grave."

The editor of the "Lancet" says, "It is admitted that for a man whose object is to do an occasional feat of mind and body—*e.g.* the chess-player, or the prize-fighter—the right thing is to abstain entirely from alcohol. But for most people whose business is not to do feats occasionally, but common work constantly, and cheerfully, and for the longest possible time, the right thing *may be* to take a moderate quantity. This has not yet been proved, but it is quite conceivable, and we are ready to pay as much heed to the opinions of serious and unbiassed physicians in the matter, as that of chemists and physiologists." Whatever the truth on this point, it is a matter of satisfaction that there is an important concurrence of weighty opinion in favour of extreme moderation, that where the question used to be between much alcohol and little, the question now is between very little and none at all. There is no medical man with a reputation to lose who would venture an apology for the habitual use of more than a very little alcohol, and this in a very diluted form. The injuriousness of the use of alcohol

in any but the smallest quantities, and these well diluted, is a point on which chemists, physiologists, and physicians are all agreed.

It is to be inferred from what chemists have already established, that the great thing the system does with alcohol is to effect its removal as soon as possible. If the quantity is not excessive its removal is probably complete, if excessive some is left in the substance of the brain, liver, and kidneys. The physiologist again tells us that the smallest quantity of alcohol, takes somewhat from the strength of the muscles, from the ability to induce extremes of temperature, from the clearness of the head, and the activity of the mind.

As physicians we know how soon the use of alcohol tells against the body, encasing it with a layer of fat or lard, destructive of all firmness of outline, either of feature or figure; and worse than this, causing the deposit of fat or oil in the fine structures of the internal organs, the tubes of the kidneys, the fibres of the heart, the cells of the brain and liver. We think it a most significant fact, and one that has not been sufficiently considered, that the organs in which alcohol is found, after being taken in large quantities and only partially eliminated, are the very organs whose structure is known to suffer from the use of it, and the impairment of which lands so many drinkers in Bright's disease (kidney disease), heart disease, delirium tremens, paralysis, and hob-nail liver. The conversion of fine structures, such as gland cells or muscular fibres into fat, seems to be one of the natural ways in which, in process of time, organisation deteriorates and life declines. It is a change which we properly associate with age, but it is strikingly accellerated in many persons by what would be regarded as a very moderate use of our stronger beer or ardent spirits. Alcohol seems to do the work of time.

The following is the opinion of the late Dr. Brinton, F.R.S., lecturer to St. Thomas's Hospital:—"Mental acuteness, accuracy of perception, and delicacy of the senses, are all so far opposed by the action of alcohol, as that the maximum efforts of each are *incompatible* with the ingestion of any moderate quantity of fermented liquid. Indeed, there is scarcely any calling which demands skilful and exact effort of mind or body, or which requires the balanced exercise of many faculties, that does not illustrate this rule. The mathematician, the gambler, the metaphysician, the billiard player, the author, the artist, the physician, would, if they could analyse their experience aright, generally concur in the statement that *a single glass will often suffice to take*, so to speak, *the edge off both mind and body*, and to reduce their capacity to something below what is relatively their perfection of work."

Alcohol as Medicine. Although the writer of this paper is not quite prepared to deny to alcohol a place as a medicine, yet in

common with numbers of his medical brethren, he believes its good effects have been vastly overrated. It was the custom two or three years ago, at the London Fever Hospital, to give very large quantities of stimulants to patients labouring under fevers of various kinds; but now Dr. Murchison, the senior physician of the Hospital, in an address to the students of the Middlesex Hospital, speaks thus: "Nothing is yet definitely settled as to the mode of administration, and the mode of action of alcohol in disease. Recent researches discredited the hypothesis that alcohol was to be regarded in the light of food in disease, and showed that in the immoderate quantities in which it had been the custom to administer it, its tendency was to disturb all the vital functions, and to counteract the vis medicatrix naturae (the healing power of nature); a fundamental blow has thus been struck at the fashionable revival of brunonism, which was believed to be responsible for the origin of intemperance among patients who survived, and dismissing not a few drunken and unconscious to another world."

When we have it upon good authority that very large quantities of wine are manufactured in France, and thence sent to Oporto, branded with the marks of that vintage and reshipped as genuine port, it is difficult to understand how physicians will prescribe anything, whose strength they know so little about. This is not the way medical men prescribe drugs; why should they do so with regard to alcohol?

"The Athenæum" gives the following information to port wine drinkers: "All port wine hitherto exported for the English market is largely mixed with brandy, and is composed almost as much of elderberries as of grapes. The way in which what in England is called port wine has hitherto been manufactured for the London market is this: The Paiz de Venhateiro abounds in elder trees; the berries of these trees are dried in the sun or in kilns. The wine is then thrown on them, and the berries are trodden (as previously the grapes) till it is thoroughly saturated with the colouring matter of the berries. Brandy is then added in the proportion of from three to sixteen gallons to every pipe of 115 gallons. This is the composition of all the port wine hitherto drunk in England. No pure wine, no wine not thus specially adulterated for the English taste, was allowed by the Government committee of tasters to pass the bar of the Douro before the year 1865."

I cannot forbear inserting the following extract from a clinical lecture, recently delivered to the students at Guy's Hospital, upon the indiscriminate use of alcoholic stimulants in disease, by Dr. S. Wilks, physician and lecturer on medicine to that hospital, as it shows most clearly what faith the public has in alcoholic liquors. "The subject of the different temperaments of your patients and

their mode of life is one which is well worth your study; but the matter I wish now to strongly enforce upon you is that you are as thoroughly to consider the propriety of the administration of alcohol as you would any drug in the Pharmacopœia. Endeavour, if you can, to erase from your minds that it is a proven fact that alcohol is a tonic or a necessary part of everyone's beverage. This is assumed by a large mass of people; and the meaning of the question which your patient puts to you when he says "What shall I drink?" is not "Shall I take a stimulant or leave it alone?" but "Shall I drink beer, wine, or spirits?" He often confesses that he is in a great difficulty; he finds none of them agree with him; but that he must take "something" appears as necessary as eating his daily bread; the alternative never having formed part of his calculation. I say it is assumed that a strength-giving property lies in these drinks—that just in proportion to a man's feeling of weakness so will he require one of them: in ordinary health he may only want his beer; but if ill, his wine; and if very ill, his spirits. Now this popular opinion is shared in, I am sorry to say, by many in the profession: if the patient is weak he wants "support," this term carrying too frequently with it the necessary idea of wine or spirits. I should be sorry to say that the doctor panders to the public taste, since he is too often already in accord with it; but the consequence of such agreement between patient and medical man resolves itself into this, that an extra stimulant is prescribed. You might ask to what complaints do I refer when I speak of this too common advice; but I need only repeat the word "patient," for it matters little what is the nature of the disease, since the reasons for the treatment are applicable to all complaints, and are founded on this simple proposition; all persons who are ill are weak, they have lost strength, they require it to be restored; alcohol is a supporter and a tonic, therefore alcohol is a remedy for all diseases. This is no parody, for I have heard the argument set forth in some such words; and practically it is adopted by many, for I constantly hear medical men say they give brandy to all their patients, for they always find them "low." Brandy indeed becomes with some as much a universal remedy as revalenta, chlorodyne, Morison's pills, or any other quack medicine. Moreover, it is a medicine of which the patients approve, assuming as they also do its supporting and strength-giving powers. You therefore cannot do better, if you fear no compunctions in converting your profession into a mere trade, to say to all your patients, after feeling their pulse, that they are very low—that you are sure they do not take enough; and order them several glasses of wine daily. Should they be exceedingly ill with some desperate organic complaint, then you must turn your remarks to the friends, and speak of the necessity of supporting the patient by giving

him as much brandy as can be poured down his throat. By this method you are sure to give "satisfaction:" for should the patient die without such treatment, you may have the credit of letting him slip "through your fingers;" whilst, if he die with it, you have done your best. If you kill a dozen patients with brandy, you need have no fear—"you have done your best." This, I say, would be a very comfortable and lucrative mode of practice."

The following statistics of the London Hospital appeared in the "Medical Journal," thus showing that the greater the quantity of stimulants given the greater the mortality. The summaries of these statistics stand thus:—From 1854 to 1858 each physician employed 12,803 ounces of wine annually; the death being 11.88 per cent. From 1860 to 1864 he employed annually 48,136 ounces; the deaths being 12.65 per cent. During 1854 to 1858 each surgeon employed annually 38,016 ounces of wine; the deaths being 4.48 per cent. During 1860 to 1864 he employed annually 142,951 ounces; the deaths being 6.65 per cent. In 1862, the general mortality of the hospital was 7.4 per cent.; the consumption of stimulants being 1,281 gallons of wine, 162 brandy, 38 gin. In 1864 the mortality was 10.5 per cent.; the quantity of stimulants consumed being 1,558 gallons of wine, 359 brandy, 62 gin.

Dr. H. R. Madden thus expresses himself in an elaborate essay on 'Stimulating Drinks,' (1847):—"Alcohol is not the *natural stimulus* to any of our organs, and hence functions performed in consequence of its application *tend to debilitate* the organ acted upon.

"Alcohol is *incapable of being assimilated*, or converted into any organic proximate principle, and hence cannot be considered nutritious.

"The strength experienced after the use of alcohol, is *not new strength added* to the system, but is manifested by calling into exercise the nervous energy pre-existing.

"The *ultimate exhausting effects* of alcohol, owing to its stimulant properties, produce *an unnatural susceptibility to morbid action in all the organs*, and this, with the plethora superinduced, becomes a fertile source of disease.

"A person who habitually exerts himself to such an extent as to require the daily use of stimulants to ward off exhaustion, may be compared to *a machine working under high pressure*. He will become *much more obnoxious to the causes of disease*, and will certainly *break down sooner* than he would have done under more favourable circumstances.

"The more frequently alcohol is had recourse to for the purpose of overcoming feelings of debility, *the more it will be required*, and by constant repetition *a period is at length reached*

when it cannot be foregone, unless re-action is simultaneously brought about by a temporary total change of the habits of life.

"Owing to the above *facts*, I conclude that the DAILY USE OF STIMULANTS IS INDEFENSIBLE UNDER ANY KNOWN CIRCUMSTANCES."

During the last few years the "British Medical Journal" has liberally opened its pages for the discussion of the question, "Is ALCOHOL FOOD OR PHYSIC?" The learned and distinguished editor, Dr. Markham, thus sums up the discussion so far as it has gone:—"We have no wish hastily to speak on this important matter, but we are in conscience bound boldly to declare the logical and inevitable conclusions, as they seem to us, to which a scientific view of the subject *forces* us. The grand practical conclusions are these:—1. That alcohol is *not* food; and that, being simply a stimulant of the nervous system, its use is hurtful to the body of a healthy man. 2. That if its imbibition *be* of service, it is so only to man in an abnormal condition; and that our duty, as men of medicine, is to endeavour to define what those particular abnormal states are in which alcohol is serviceable. 3. That ordinary social indulgence in alcoholic drinks, for society's sake, is, medically speaking, a very unphysiological and prejudicial proceeding."

L.R.C.P.L.

ART. VI.—MUTUAL FORBEARANCE AND FORGIVENESS.*

ALTHOUGH this subject may be designated as intensely practical, and although theory without practice may possess little intrinsic value, it is nevertheless of importance we should obtain sound and accurate views of Christian duty. If we hold an incorrect theory, it will be likely to lead to an erroneous practice, and may occasion such inconsistencies as will not only mar the excellence, but neutralise the influence of our Christian profession. On the other hand, an intelligent and scriptural theory will furnish a safe guide to consistent and exemplary conduct.

I. *Unquestionably, forbearance and forgiveness claim a pro-*

* An address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Minister's Association, Sunderland, May 8th, 1867.

minent place in the system of Christian ethics. The cultivation of such a spirit not only gives the true cast of Christian character, but exhibits one of its most distinctive and attractive features. Christian charity thus developed, draws a line of marked distinction between a Christian and an unbeliever. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

II. *In Holy Writ we find the highest authority for the exercise of such a spirit.* Both the Old and New Testament furnish the most copious references to it. It constituted an essential part of the moral law in the old dispensation, and was distinctly inculcated by Christ in the new; for "He came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law and the prophets." Although chiefly in an incidental manner, yet most extensively and expressively did he teach it. The apostolic precepts are highly seasoned with it, and most distinctly may we see the subject running through the entire range of Scripture. It is enforced by commandment, taught by parable, developed by example, set forth in Gospel ministrations, and in all systems of moral science that have the warrant of Scripture it holds a prominent place.

III. We presume it is not necessary to give a lengthened definition of the Christian duties of *forgiveness* and *forbearance*. Their true origin is in the love of God; that spirit by which they are fulfilled cannot be realised from any other source. Human nature apart from this does not possess it. Under provocation and injury man inclines in the opposite direction, and indulges in the passions of resentment and revenge. The Christian spirit requires the conquest of self, the sacrifice of offended dignity, and of all desire for vindictive retribution. There is no doubt considerable difference in individuals; to those who hold high views of their own rights and honour the difficulty of conquering self must be great; the higher the sense of personal dignity, and the greater the difficulty of pardoning an offence. These high thoughts of self are natural to man. But that charitable disposition by which Christians should be actuated towards each other, is far superior to the dispositions of unregenerate humanity, and can only be exercised when much divine love is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost which is given to believers. Hence it is to be regarded as a divine affection. Richard Watson says, "It is an imperfect or simulated sentiment if it flow not from the love of God, the sure mark of a regenerate nature. There may indeed be a degree of natural benevolence; the indirect influence of a benevolent nature may counteract the selfish and malevolent feelings; and education, where well directed, will come in to the aid of nature. Yet the principle as a religious one, and in its full operation, can only result from a supernatural change of our nature, because that alone can subdue those affec-

tions which counteract benevolence and charity in their efficient and habitual manifestation."

The excellency of such a spirit may be seen by considering its counteractive power over opposite influences. It suppresses all angry feelings and malicious designs; it subdues implacable dispositions, and inspires kind and generous emotions; it annihilates the spirit of revenge and shows acts of kindness towards offenders. It disallows prejudice. Instead of evil surmisings, rash judgment, and an uncharitable interpretation of motives, "It thinketh no evil." It condemns a slanderous and backbiting tongue, censoriousness, and all attempts to damage character. It excludes all unfair dealing, and whatever is calculated to injure the interests of others; delighting both to do and to suffer for their benefit and happiness. In the development of such a spirit these are its fruits, and by such evidences shall it be known.

IV. The obligation under which every Christian is placed to *forbear* and to *forgive*, is rooted in a twofold relationship; first, *to God;* secondly, *to man.* The course of conduct opposed to the requirement of this obligation will be attended with the most serious results. First, as it regards his relation to God; "For if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father, which is in heaven, forgive you your trespasses." So much is it an essential condition of our forgiveness with God, that the Saviour made it a distinct petition in his model prayer: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us." How paltry are the offences that men may commit against us, compared with the grave offences we have comitted against God! And how would it fare with us if God were to be as exacting and unwilling to forgive our manifold transgressions, as we too often are when a slight offence is committed against us by our fellow-man?

> "Alas! alas!
> Why all the souls that are were forfeit once;
> And he that might the advantage best have took
> Found out the remedy. How would you be,
> If He who is the top of judgment should
> But judge you as you are?"

The consequences of such conduct are strikingly set forth in the Saviour's parable of the five hundred and the fifty pence debtors.

Secondly, the relation in which we stand to our fellow-Christian. "This relation involves the obligation to cultivate those dispositions, and to follow that line of conduct that will harmonise with that relationship. The uniformity of the character and conduct of the individual with the relation in which he stands to his fellow-Christian is a proof of his rectitude," and that the

exercise of forgiveness and forbearance is essential to such rectitude is quite apparent.

Our unwillingness to forgive an offender is calculated to cast grave doubts on the genuineness of our piety, "for if we love not our brother whom we have seen, how can we love God whom we have not seen?" "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." Of what avail are all our pretensions to Christian excellency, while a disposition of resentment is rankling in our bosoms? it gives the lie to our profession, it is the "dead fly in the pot of ointment." To forbear and forgive is Christ-like and God-like; to be resentful and spiteful is world-like and devil-like.

V. We have no warrant to restrain the exercise of a forbearing and forgiving spirit within certain limits; none are laid down in the Scriptures. It has been justly remarked that the exercise of our forgiveness will greatly depend on circumstances. We should not cherish everlasting malice against a person who accidentally trod on our toes; but our forbearance might fail us if the accident happened several times a day. Where we do not care very much for the offence which has been committed, when it has not particularly hurt or annoyed us, it is surprisingly easy to forgive; but when we have been really wounded, when the words have been most unkind, and the actions most trying, when an injury has been done to us wilfully, then there are many things easier than to forgive. In answer to Peter's question on this point Christ returned a clear and unmistakeable reply. Peter wished to know whether seven times would be sufficient to forgive an offending brother. Jesus gave him to understand that the number of times was not to be limited, but that he must forgive though his brother should offend "seventy times seven," an expression by which we are to understand that always, and without reserve, are we to exercise such a disposition.

We do not regard it as un-Christian, or a compromise of the rule which Christ gave to Peter, when a wicked action is done to us, to cherish a moral detestation of the action itself, just as if it were done to anyone else, while at the same time we exercise a benevolent spirit towards the offender, by our own readiness to forgive.

Some might query whether a forgiving and forbearing spirit should be exercised where it is not duly appreciated. In such a case would it not be like "casting pearls before swine?" and would not the purpose for which it is exercised be defeated? As God requires repentance when he forgives, are we required to forgive where so far from there being signs of contrition offence is

added to offence? It might be said in reply that although God from his very nature must abominate the wicked conduct of the sinner, he does not withdraw his mercy from him, but continues his goodness that it may lead him to repentance. We should certainly have greater pleasure in exercising a forgiving spirit were it to be appreciated by the offender. At the same time that does not affect the obligation under which we are placed. As an able writer on Moral Sciences has said, "No treatment which we have received from another gives us by the law of God any right to treat him in any other manner than with kindness. That he has violated his duty towards us and towards God, affords no reason why we should be guilty of the same crime. Hence in all cases we are bound to govern ourselves not by the treatment we have received at the hands of others, but according to the law by which God has directed our intercourse to be governed."

Objection might be taken to this view on the ground of tampering with or weakening the sense of moral obligation. The objector might say, "if I must unconditionally forgive an offender, would it not to some extent be ignoring my own rights, lessening my own dignity, and giving him license to continue offence? would it not strengthen his malicious propensity, seeing that as often as he commits an offence I am quite ready to forgive? and hence he may go on provoking and offending "ad libitum?" But let us look at the opposite phase of the question, that is, an unreserved and unconditional exercise of a forgiving disposition, and ask, which is most in harmony with the Christian character and with the genius of the Gospel? Is our duty to be determined, and the exercise of our Christian affection to be regulated by the repentance or non-repentance of a delinquent? and if there be no acknowledgement of wrong are we to cherish resentment to the day of our death, and nurse in our bosom unkindly dispositions to the same extent as unrequited offences are multiplied? Are we to withhold our forgiveness till the last farthing of humble acknowledgement and reparation be paid? May it not be that a spirit of relenting has taken possession of the offender and circumstances will not allow such a thorough and open confession as we think is due? Whether it be so or not, we presume Christian charity shines out more conspiciously, and operates more effectually when exercised independently of the merits of our adversary.

But to place the question beyond dispute, we will refer it to the highest authority—the fiat of the Great Head of the Church. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you that ye visit not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also."

Is it not far better to sacrifice the pleasure of revenge, if pleasure it may be called, and imitate him who when "He was reviled, reviled not again"? What is the momentary gratification of pride and malice, followed by regret, to the Christ-like conduct of frankly and freely forgiving an injury? "The tendency of retaliation is to increase, foster, and to multiply wrongs absolutely, and without end. It renders neither party better, but always renders both parties worse. The offended, who retaliates, does a mean action, when he might have done a noble one."

On the other hand it is quite possible that the manifestations of a forgiving spirit may be the very means of disarming the offender of unkindly dispositions. Love is a more powerful conqueror than hate. It quenches the fire of enmity and strife, and banishes those feelings that produce coolness and jealousy, and destroy the pleasures of friendly intercourse.

"There is a golden cord of sympathy
Fix'd in the harp of every soul,
Which, by the breath of kindness when 'tis swept,
Wakes angel-melodies in savage hearts:
Inflicts some chastisements for treasured wrong,
And melts the ice of hate to streams of love:
Nor aught but kindness that fine chord can touch."

Another writer has said, "Forgiveness is a hearty generous thing. It blots out the past and makes the present gladsome and sacred. It will hear no humbling words; it will have no prostration in its presence. It takes the offender into its warmest heart, and loads him with love-tokens. It scorns insinuations and inuendos, and reminders. Over all that happened long ago the sea of loving kindness has flowed, and the place of offence can no more be seen." In the following lines we have the true ring of Christian charity.

"Forgive thy foes; nor that alone,
Their evil deeds with good repay;
Fill those with joy who owe thee none,
And kiss the hand uprais'd to slay.
So does the fragrant sandal bow
In meek forgiveness to its doom,
And o'er the axe at every blow
Sheds in abundance rich perfume."

The free operation of this spirit need not contravene the regulations of church discipline. That some kind of discipline is necessary for the consistency, purity, and prosperity of the church is manifest, and in reference to the treatment of offenders, the Saviour has laid down an unexceptionable rule which, while it does not compromise the claims of justice and equity, gives sufficient scope for the exercise of Christian charity, harmonizing with St.

Paul's injunction: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

In a case of litigation between professing Christians, it might be asked, "to what extent should a disposition of forbearance and forgiveness be exercised?" We quote Dr. Paly on this point, "St. Paul, though no one inculcated forgiveness and forbearance with a deeper sense of the value and obligation of these virtues, did not interpret either of them to require an unresisting submission to every contumely, or a neglect of the means of safety and self defence. He took refuge in the laws of his country, and in the privileges of a Roman citizen, from the conspiracy of the Jews, and from the clandestine violence of the chief captain. And yet this is the same apostle who reproved the litigiousness of his Corinthian converts with so much severity: 'Now, therefore, there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?' * * * Christianity excludes all vindictive motives, and all frivolous causes of prosecution; so that where the injury is small, where no good purpose of public example is answered, where forbearance is not likely to invite a repetition of the offence, or where the expense of an action becomes a punishment too severe for the offence; there the Christian is withholden by the authority of his religion from going to law."

How much better would it be if, instead of brother going to law with brother, and demanding the full measure of justice, the principle of Christian charity were allowed full sway! Were this Christ-like disposition allowed to decide the question, what an amount of ill feeling and needless expense would be prevented! Instead of exposing the inconsistences of religious profession in the eyes of the world, and destroying valuable friendship and profitable intercourse, the exercise of mutual love would be the best method of settling disputes.

VI. Mutual forbearance and forgiveness should be promptly exercised. The more immediate the exercise the more easily is it accomplished. Sometimes we may be unwilling to forgive till we have indulged in resentment, and the storm of evil passions has spent itself. It is for the purpose of checking those passions that it should be unhesitatingly manifested. The uncertainity of life affords a strong reason why we should readily forgive. The thought of leaving the world without some intimation of forgiveness towards a delinquent is anything but satisfactory and pleasant. If we have any degree of resentment towards an offender, would it not be safer and more satisfactory to forgive now, lest an opportunity never present itself? "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath."

VII. Our individual peace and happiness would be greatly pro-

moted by the exercise of this charitable disposition. Nothing is more distinctive to our comfort than enmity of heart. What does it matter what a man's circumstances be if there are rankling in his bosom uncharitable and spiteful feelings? He may possess the greatest amount of wealth, and exercise the highest degree of authority, but without the possession of a forgiving disposition like one of old, he may say, "All this availeth me nothing, while Mordecai sitteth at the gate." Bacon has said, "Certainly it is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move with charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth." How much better is it for the mind to be kept in a state of tranquility, and to exercise a generous disposition, than to be tormented with bitter remembrances of old grievances and agitated with feelings of anger! As the same writer says: "This is certain, that a man that studieth revenge keepeth his own wounds green, which would otherwise heal, and do well. That which is past is gone and irrevocable, and wise men have enough to do with things present and to come. Therefore they do but trifle with themselves that labor in past matters."

VIII. The exercise of a forgiving spirit is essential to our growth in piety. There are certain Christian graces which greatly depend on adverse influences for their development. For instance, tribulation occasions the exercise of patience, for "tribulation worketh patience," so also provocation and injury call forth the exercise of forbearance and forgiveness. In what other way than by the application of such tests, can we ascertain the excellence or even the existence of such dispositions? Graces that have never been tried can hardly be called graces. Not that we would be understood by this mode of reasoning to advocate the absolute necessity of moral evil, for the production of moral good, but that this arrangement is in perfect harmony with a probationary state. And as it must be that offences will come "it is in the exercise of forbearance and forgiveness that we are to conduct ourselves, and thus diminish rather than increase the amount of evil dispositions that reign in the human breast, and develop themselves in malicious conduct.

To indulge in a spirit of resentment spreads a light over all the Christian graces. Many a healthy and promising tree has been stunted in its growth and blighted in its blossom, and when examined the injury has been traceable to some poisonous matter in its vital part, or some destructive insect gnawing at its root. So in a spiritual sense a disposition of retaliation proves deleterious to the growth and perfection of the Christian graces. It is a cankerworm. It prevents the flood of kindly feeling, and the performance of generous acts, and inflicts a permanent injury on the soul's prosperity.

But under the benign influences of a forgiving spirit, Christian motive, principle, and feeling, will grow and flourish. When we can rise above vindictiveness, the heart expands, generous dispositions develop, the mind is freed from further anxiety, and the Saviour's injunction is fulfilled: "Love them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you."

IX. The development of such a spirit constitutes the most magnanimous character. It stamps us with true nobility when we can act above the mere feeling of justice. As Wayland remarks: "Every one must acknowledge this to be the course pointed out by the most exalted virtue. Every man's conscience testifies that to reward evil with good is noble, while the opposite course is mean. There is nothing more strongly indicative of littleness of spirit than revenge. * * * No man can long continue to injure him who requites injury with nothing but goodness." When a spirit of retaliation is fostered it is adding one fire to another, and there is no end to it. "But this mode of treating an injurious person is to diminish indefinitely the liability to injury, and to render all parties both happier and better." Certainly in taking revenge a man is but even with his enemy, but in passing it over he is superior, for it is a prince's part to pardon, and Solomon says, "It is the glory of a man to pass by an offence."

> "'Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes
> The monarch better than his crown,
> His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,
> The attribute to awe and majesty,
> Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings.
> It is an attribute of God himself;
> And earthly power doth there show likest God
> When mercy seasons justice."

X. In a community of Christians such a spirit is essential to unity and harmony. In such a community there is necessarily a great diversity of opinion and sentiment, and a great contrast of character. We view subjects from so many different stand-points that we can not always see eye to eye; and hence an exercise of forbearance, and the cultivation of a charitable spirit, are duties at once reasonable and necessary. Except such a course be taken unity and peace cannot be maintained.

It has been justly remarked that "to make all men constitutionally alike is not the aim of the Christian church, nor is it the purpose of the Holy Spirit to bring his subjects into a oneness of view and sentiment on matters not essential to salvation. Of this a united church is aware, and provision is made for the maintainance of unity in the cultivation and exercise of a forbearing spirit." It should ever be remembered that there is no error that our brethren may commit, but to which we ourselves are liable,

and "as we would that others should do unto us, even so should we do unto them." "We should bring to bear every motive that can induce, and every virtue that would encourage our Christian charity. Inasmuch as the entire unity of the church depends on the love of its individual members, the apostolic injunction should be engraven on our hearts and developed in our demeanour: 'Let brotherly love continue.'"

XI. For the sake of consistency, and the recommendation of the Christian religion, all Christians should uniformly practice forgiveness and forbearance. To every observant mind this is one of the most powerful arguments for the superiority of the Christian character. How else is the world to know the superiority of Christians but by the superiority of their conduct? And is not this to be one of the most powerful inducements in winning the world to Christ? And does not an opposite course of conduct occasion results equally injurious? How frequently has the world had occasion to exult over the glaring inconsistences of professing Christians! and instead of extorting the exclamation, "See how these Christians love;" it is, "behold! how these so-called Christians hate."

Where there are bickerings, strife, and malice among Christians, instead of peace, love, and concord, where is the proof of their superiority? "for if ye love them that love you what thank have ye? do not even the publicans so?" The cause of Christ becomes damaged by those who should recommend its claims and cherish its interests. Christ is wounded in the house of his friends.

Were a larger measure of that charity diffused in the church, which "suffereth long and is kind," which "envieth not, and is not easily provoked," which "thinketh no evil," which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and which hideth a multitude of sins," a brighter era would dawn, and the world would be captivated by its excellence. How many more might be induced to embrace the Christian religion, and how much sooner might the glorious period arrive when all men shall dwell together in the delightful bonds of Christian brotherhood! Seeing that Christian charity thus developed is so essential to the completion of our character as individual Christians, and so desirable for the harmony, peace, and prosperity of the church in general, "let us therefore put on charity which is the bond of perfectness."

L. F. ARMITAGE.

ART. VII.—GOVERNMENT GRANTS.

OUGHT, OR OUGHT NOT, THE PRIMITIVE METHODIST CONNEXION TO RECEIVE GOVERNMENTAL AID FOR ITS DAY SCHOOLS?*

IN the interest of this inquiry we grant that *ignorance* is a baleful wrong, an anachronism, a thing utterly and necessarily intolerable everywhere. We concede that *a little knowledge*, though good in so far as it extends, may often lead to the perversion of great principles, and thus result in evil and pernicious consequences. We also affirm that to provide the best possible means for the communication of knowledge is a relative duty sustained by the solemn sanctions of the Divine law, which in its performance meets an indispensable requirement in every man's condition.

We are also prepared to admit, that religious bodies may have duties towards their adherents and those whose adherence they are desirous to gain, which arise out of and are connected with the concessions and affirmation just made,—as parents have their peculiar duties towards their children and governments towards their subjects. And we further own that it is as the Primitive Methodist Connexion has recognised the positions here conceded and affirmed, and, under God, met the requirements they involve, that its extraordinary success has been realised; but it certainly does not fall within the limits of this inquiry to decide what the duties of religious communities always are, nor to admit for discussion the duties of governments towards their subjects, nor those of parents towards their children, nor to take any notice of secular education apart from the specific work of the Primitive Methodist Connexion, nor to recognise any such notion of the connexional educational activity as would in any sense or any degree represent its work in this department as merely secular; neither does this discussion relate to the establishment of schools, nor has it anything to do with the ordinary means of their support, except in so far as these means may have to be referred to in illustration of some particular phase of the subject.

The question under consideration embraces two distinct, vital, and all-important points. First.—*The inseparable and distinct connexionalism of those Primitive Methodist Schools already established and of those yet to be established.* Second—*The character of this particular kind of auxiliary aid;* and then arises

* An article maintaining the affirmative of the question will appear in our November number.—ED.

out of these two points the vitally important inquiry, is it *right* or is it *wrong* to accept the aid for denominational schools? and also the subordinately important inquiry, is the aid really necessary, or is it unnecessary? In the question as we have stated it, Primitive Methodist schools are recognised as an accomplished fact, as a series of connexional institutions already established and already increasing. And as an accomplished fact, as a series of already established and increasing connexional institutions, they are worthy of the most careful consideration in any view which can legitimately be taken in this inquiry; for they will evidently occupy a distinguished place among the institutions of the Connexion, and exert a mighty influence in upholding the intellectual and moral character of those whom we expect to become the future friends, members, office-bearers, and ministers of our church. In this inquiry, state-raised and taxationally-produced aid—in the production of which there is not felt, even in the lowest degree, the influence of that peculiar law of love which regulates Christian action and finds its expression in free and voluntary offerings before God for the establishment of his cause in the earth,—is not contemplated in relation to the government offering it, but in relation to our connexional purpose and aim; and the importance of this aspect of the subject cannot be over estimated, for it is markedly manifest that the question cannot long continue to merely influence the private opinion and judgment of some of the Connexion's friends, or even to be advanced as a subject for connexional consideration; it must soon be utterly abandoned as a dangerous and fatal innovation upon the Connexion's voluntaryism, or be officially and unrestrictedly accepted, with all its issues of fact, precedent, power, and influence. And in the hope of its being accepted, its friends have introduced it as a subject for connexional consideration; and it is the possibility and probability of its being accepted which invests the question at the head of this paper with an importance that perhaps, otherwise, could not have been attributed to it.

The inquiry, therefore, as we purpose pursuing it may be stated thus: Government or state-raised and taxationally-produced aid is available for the assistance of Primitive Methodist day schools, which schools are distinctly and inseparably connexional. Now is it right or is it necessary for the connexion to accept of it? We observe—

I. THAT THE OFFER OF THIS AID BY GOVERNMENT, AND ITS ACCEPTANCE BY OTHER RELIGIOUS BODIES DO NOT CONSTITUTE IT EITHER RIGHT OR NECESSARY FOR OUR CONNEXION TO ACCEPT IT.

The Connexion is neither morally nor necessarily bound to any particular course of action by this government offer. It has little in common with the government in an educational movement.

This governmentally-made available aid, may be, for ought the Connexion may decide, the result of profound statesmanship, or of the veriest state craft. It may be a graceful tribute offered to the intelligence, liberality, and patriotism of the various nonconforming communities, or a meagre dole allowed by the partizans of the great and dominant religious party to the other sections of the Church, for the purpose of keeping them from active interference with those endowments which are exclusively appropriated by the Established Church. It may be a political expedient, and contain proof positive that the government is neither actuated by lofty principle, nor endeavouring to work out a true theory of national education; but not being able to conceal the prevalence of ignorance and its attendant evils in the country, and feeling it a sad and bitter anomoly, which in its own proper realm, and in the exercise of its own proper authority, it is unable to remove, it is content to vote freely the money, which, raised for national purposes is at its disposal, to any of the religious or secular bodies which will conform to a few elementary conditions, and extricate it from the gigantic difficulties which impede its ordinary action; or it may afford an inferential ground of belief that government considers it to be its duty, directly and systematically to educate the people, but is yet obliged, because of the state of political or other parties, to compromise itself, to forego its own important functions, to abandon what is abstractedly or politically right, and to be content, ignobly and indirectly to teach Churchism—high, low, and broad, with all their divisions, subdivisions and cross divisions—together with Romanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Mormonism, and even (if it could be so base as to use the Bible for the purpose) Atheism. This system may be politically right or politically wrong, a point which at present we do not determine, but which ever it is, it is an unquestionable fact that England has no real or direct national education for the children of its poorer criminal populations, and that the national money is given in an indirect manner to promote either or sundry of the isms, the supporters of which will undertake to teach in a school room of prescribed dimensions and admit the government inspector to ascertain if the contract entered into with the state is carried into effect in the working of their school. Is it then for *free* Primitive Methodism to become a party to such an arrangement? Can it then be right or necessary for the Connexion to accept grants, when the morality of such an act can even upon the most distant ground of possibility be considered questionable? Or is it at all reasonable that the Connexion should encumber itself with the trammels of the state, and lean upon a species of aid, which, when it has emasculated our connexional voluntaryism, and produced a servile spirit of dependence, may, because of the

assertions of the nation's rights, and by the onward march of freedom, be ultimately withdrawn?

And the Connexion is not morally or necessarily bound by any other religious community accepting this aid. The standards, codes, customs, and ethics, (apart from those of Christ and the Gospel) which influence such bodies, are not guides for Primitive Methodism. Its relations to this subject are widely different from those characteristics of the communities which chiefly receive, or which are willing to receive such aid. It has not the vast and ancient State Church traditionary accumulations, which long before the existence of this nineteenth-century-born zeal for education, brought down to the Episcopal Church—from the tyrannic, debased, and superstitious dark ages—the technical and acknowledged political right to annual state-provided millions sterling for all sorts of Church purposes. Nor has it the position, wealth and influence, which, with all their tremendous evil, and modicum of good, have grown up within the Established Church. Nor has it the withering worldliness, spiritual apathy, decrepitude and selfishness too extensively and manifestly existent in the State Church. It is also free from that dominancy of spirit, developed in the acts of convocations, and of rectors and vicars holding extreme views, who inconsistently adopt the practice of outright voluntaryism, rather than comply with the "conscience clause," and fall back upon the acceptance of state aid for their schools when that clause is either a dead letter, or can be accomodated or evaded to suit their narrow ecclesiastical purposes. The Connexion is also devoid of that essentially papistical spirit, which, in Ireland (where there is a national system of education in operation), as everywhere, repudiates the interference of the state in church affairs, and tolerates not for a moment either a national system of education, or any of the co-existing established or non-established churches, while at the same time it seeks by every artifice and plot, as well as by bold and undisguised action to secure for itself state-provided and exclusively denominational advantages in schools, colleges, and churches. The regium domun which agitates the councils of the Irish Presbyterian church; and the propriety of state assistance, which as a remnant of previous connection with the state is still maintained in the *Free* Scottish Presbyterian Church, and John Wesley's hereditary and personal prejudice in favour of state support, and the apparently consequent readiness in Wesleyan Methodism to receive state grants when tendered or possible for other purposes than the education of youth, do not either separately or unitedly render it in any degree right or necessary for Primitive Methodism to accept government aid for educational purposes.

There are not the same reasons in Primitive Methodism for receiving government aid as are concluded to exist, either really or

hypothetically, in those communities receiving or prepared to receive state assistance. It does not proceed to consider the rightfulness or necessity of government grants under the influence of a long continued appropriation of state aid for all ecclesiastical purposes, by which an unquestioning acquiesence in the propriety of Church and State connection has been produced, but in the purer region of a distinct, declared, and invariable voluntaryism. It may be that the supposed pecuniary advantages which these communities receiving government aid are supposed to have over Primitive Methodism in relation to day schools, encompassed as these supposed advantages are by the mist and shadow of distance—are bedazzling it for the time being, and making it forgetful of that wherein its true strength lies. But can the Connexion so far forget itself in the prejudices, customs, traditions, and practices of those receiving state aid as to join with the proudest and most prosperous of them in asserting its right to and necessity for government support for its Home and Foreign Missions; for the building and sustenance of its chapels and other institutions, and for the auxiliary support of its ministerial students and ministers at home and abroad, and from thence decend by the easy declivity of a blinded conscientiousness to maintain the propriety of accepting state aid for its schools? Or can it begin with the acceptance of state aid for the building and sustenance of its school room, and the support of its school masters and school mistresses in training and in work, and thence proceed to maintain the propriety of government support for those other ecclesiastical purposes for which it is possible to obtain it? We affirm—it *cannot!* but until it can, and is also prepared for all the results and consequences of receiving state aid for these several kindred purposes and objects—which ever may be placed first in order—it cannot legitimately find either a right or a necessity for receiving state aid for its schools merely because other religious communities take it for their schools, and have accruing advantages. We observe—

II. THAT THE CONNEXION ITSELF IN ANY OF ITS VITAL, IMPORTANT, GENERAL OR SPECIAL FEATURES, FACTS, PRINCIPLES, OR POSITIONS IS THE STRONGEST EVIDENCE TO ITSELF THAT IT WOULD BE UTTERLY WRONG AND ABSOLUTELY UNNECESSARY TO ACCEPT OF THIS GOVERNMENT AID FOR ITS DAY SCHOOLS.

A consideration of what the Connexion is in spirit, headship, duty of alegiance to its head, laws, aims, past, present, and immediate future will illustrate this.

And what is it in spirit and headship? It is an agregation of converted souls; the spiritual manifestation of the Son of God in the hearts of believers, who, as adopted children of God, are united in one coherent and compact body in Christ, who "is the head of the body—the Church."

What is the allegiance due to its head? A deep and all-yielding spirit of obedience to him by whom its members are justified, accepted and exalted to the fullest fellowship and heirship of grace and glory, and whose supreme and absolute right it is to claim in all their practice that his will shall be their only and invariable rule, and that their lives, substance, talents, and all shall be fully surrendered according to his pleasure for the benefit of the church and the world, and also as a manifestation of their sincere attachment to him.

What is it in its laws and methods of government? Constitutionalism! It is not a species of blind and erring absolutism which ever needs some strong foreign force or check to control its action, bind its energy, and stay its arm, in order to prevent its degeneration into the worst of tyranny—tyranny over the minds and consciences of men. Nor is it a lax, effete, and powerless latitudinarianism, involving no responsibilities, allowing its provisions to receive every variety of interpretation, and admitting almost every form of opinion. It is a system of clear, well defined, distinct, and rational constitutionalism which provides that its true and legitimate aims, principles, powers, and provisions shall be carried into effect according to approved constitutional means and methods, and by these alone.

What is it in its aims? It is an embodiment of living faith in a living God; an effusion of the rarest beneficence towards the whole human race. It is grace and truth in force and form for the world's good; divinest thought and devoutest feeling conspire in its provision to promote man's highest weal; elevating hope and all-embracing love put forth in it their mighty efforts with only such outer means as can proceed from those whose consecration and whose present and continuous service is entire, spontaneous, and in some degree after the example of Jesus, and those who in the first Christian ages were his.

What is it in its past? It is not perfection. There may have been in its precedure occasionally the adoption of questionable expedients; the false schemes of the interested, the ebullitions of selfishness, and the eddyings of human folly may sometimes have diminished its strength, blemished its records, and grieved its genuine friends; but in these the rule of its action is not to be sought. Wherever and whenever introduced, they have been the exceptional — unwarrantably and dangerously exceptional— and certainly ought not to be repeated until they have the force of precedents, and superinduce in the body a general and fatally chronic cause of weakness and decay. In these questionable or obviously erroneous expedients we are not furnished with the characteristic past of the Connexion; this is to be seen in such scenes as that at Bemersley, when the great, good, and now glorified *Hugh Bourne* received the grace of God, and when to him all

things became new, and he desired in his heart that friends and foes, and even the whole world, if possible, should be saved. The characteristic past of the Connexion is seen in that power of faith and love which led its earliest preachers to pass from village to village without episcopal ordination, educational preparation, or a cleared way, to preach Christ to the wanderer, till the reclaimed abounded in neighbouring churches, and a new and separate community, of which they had been the unintentional founders, startled them by its necessary and pressing demand for leadership. The past of the Connexion may be read in that nobleness which ever since the conviction dawned upon its leading minds, that God had a distinct work for it to do in the world, has dared the utmost, met enraged mobs without fear, carried God's truth into the neglected and depraved abodes of infamy, conquered the most rugged hearts by the power of quenchless love, planted churches, built chapels, and established schools without aid from the state, and spent life and strength until the three kingdoms, several of the colonies, parts of the United States, and even isolated places in India and Africa have resounded with the songs of its ransomed ones. This past is—as we desire the future to be—in harmony with the wise and judicious words of one of our leading connexional missionaries (Rev. J. Long), "When in the course of Providence and in the path of duty it is clear that a work should be undertaken for Christ, it is the best way to *do it*, to *do it at once*, and above all to *do it in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*, and he will give the needful blessing."

What is it in its present? Its present—the gathered fruit of innumerable toils—the precious result of devotedness to God and intense love for man—is a position of impregnable strength in the hearts of the people, securing a constantly accumulating power in property, resources, institutions, and means of doing good in the world; and also a respectful, confiding deference and recognition among the various classes of British society, and developing a wonderful elasticity and adaptation in meeting the wants of those places accessible to its agency.

And what is it in the immediate future? A marvellous power for good or for evil over vast multitudes of men. It has a great and constantly growing responsibility. If it is faithful unto its Divine Head, itself, its spirit, its duty, its laws, its aim, its past and even its present, its influence may increase unto the last day; but if unfaithful it must wane, or be changed into a deceitful and misleading influence.

Focalise, therefore, all these considerations:—the divine spirituality which unites this body in its members to Christ; its duty to the Lord Jesus, of which voluntaryism, similar in operation to the unworldly, self-abnegating voluntaryism of the man Christ

Jesus, and to that of his first disciples, is undoubtedly a prominent part; its essential constitutionalism, including conditions under which Christian and scriptural voluntaryism has had, and will continue to have ample scope for developement, but which will not, by any possibility of construction admit of what is so opposite and contrary to the spirit and tendency as the reception of state aid for religious educational purposes. Its glorious, world-wide, and beneficent aims; its vast accumulation of accomplished deeds; its unshaded reputation of being a sound and useful section of the Christian church; its influence, which is sure to grow with the accomplishment of its specific work; and in the concentrated light of these vitally important considerations it must be evident that there can be no supposed advantages which will warrant the acceptance of an aid that will change the whole connexional character, strip it of its peculiar power, and unfit it for its great and glorious mission, and that it is utterly wrong and absolutely unnecessary for the Connexion to adopt such a miserable makeshift, and resort to an expedient so questionable as this proposed reception of government aid for its day schools.

A consideration of the Connexion's peculiar position in relation to day schools will render it still more obvious that government aid is unnecessary. The Connexion's power of adaptation to the wants of many places, and its general ability to obtain standing and support in the smallest of them, make it impossible for it to establish schools wherever its operations extend. Day schools are not a necessity of its existence; they are important to it, and will hereafter be more so; but they are as yet few in number, and it is highly probable that the proportion of their increase will be small for a considerable period, as the Connexion is in no degree dependent upon their establishment for the accomplishment of its specific work amongst the ignorant and degraded. Of the 6,175 reported preaching places, there are probably more than 5,000 in which it is not possible to establish connexional day schools. In a few of the larger of these places there are ably conducted and voluntarily supported undenominational day schools already; in the smaller places connexional day schools could not be sustained, either with government aid or without it; now if the Connexion introduced day schools into these larger places, already supplied with educational facilities, the step would not be necessary, and its usefulness exceedingly questionable, and the attempt in the smaller places would be beset with difficulties that could not be removed. This appears to us the peculiar relation in which the Connexion stands to day schools. Wherever it has established day schools, wherever it is possible or prudent for it to establish them, it has the "practicable" and requisite power to call forth all the means needed for their support. The Connexion in all cases where a day school is

indispensable, can command parental influence and support, and in most instances this will be found amply sufficient; but when, in town or village, it may not be adequate to meet the necessary outlay, then the Connexion can fall back upon the invaluable auxiliary aid of its members, brethren, and friends, who, understanding the obligation to give as God hath prospered them, and feeling sufficiently interested in educational measures, are prepared to contribute "as good stewards of the manifest grace of God." This invaluable aid may always be found, either in the places where the schools are required and established, or in other parts of the Connexion. And now that educational measures are under consideration, and while so much monetary power is lying comparatively undeveloped and unutilised for connexional purposes, an excellent opportunity is offered to direct general attention to the importance of free-will offerings to God, and also to institute other means for the establishment and maintenance of a General Day School Auxiliary Fund, by which denominational education could be promoted without any revolution of principle or taking wrongly and unnecessarily government grants, or resorting to means at all unquestionable. Let the Connexion rise to the greatness of its privileged position and in the strength of all-believing confidence and trust in God, its all-sufficient and living Head, meet its weighty obligation, and the result will speedily prove that, baptised afresh with the Holy Spirit's power, strong in the consciousness of a living Saviour's presence, and rich in the blessings of a Triune God, it is capable of accomplishing all that legitimately falls within its province of action.

R. T.

Art. VIII.—METAPHYSICAL PREACHING.

THE institution of preaching is designed to convince man of his spiritual need, lead him to God, and establish him in truth and righteousness; and any inquiry designed to render preaching more effective cannot be regarded as unimportant. This is all we offer in justification of the following observations on metaphysical preaching. It may be proper to state that the metaphysical method is not advanced as a model of what all preaching ought to be. Probably no specific kind of preaching—whether the distinctive

characteristic be found in the form under which a subject is discussed, the nature of the subject itself, or the philosophical spirit in which the discussion is conducted—ought to be elevated to the dignity of model preaching. The intellectual proclivities of men differ widely, and what constitutes the excellence of one may not appear as the distinguishing excellence of another. In preaching the particular endowments of men may find extensive scope for development, and be directed by unity of spirit to the accomplishment of the same great design. Within this sphere the imagination may find ample space and sufficient material, and here also the faculty of abstraction may realise its highest exercise; the minutest criticism, and the loftiest philosophical generalisation have equally a place and function in the institution of preaching. But while the metaphysical method cannot be advanced as the model to which all preaching ought to conform, and while allowance must be made for predominant mental tendencies, we are nevertheless disposed to invest it with considerable importance, and hesitate not to avow a conviction that its more extensive cultivation would be an unquestionable advantage both to preachers and churches.

Against metaphysical preaching there exists a considerable degree of prejudice, arising principally from misunderstanding. It is commonly regarded as dreamy, indefinite, pithless discourse, divorced from practical aim, and beyond the apprehension of the great majority of hearers. Metaphysical method in preaching is confounded with the preaching of metaphysics. Now, whatever occasion there may have been given in the progress of speculative thought for the common opinion concerning metaphysical science, we demur to this dictum as furnishing a correct view of metaphysical preaching. It is acknowledged that Christian truth affords amplest scope for the highest exercise of human thought, and it is also allowed that it is definitely and directly related to human life and destiny; but it is equally unquestionable that the relations of Christian truth to human life can only be fully realised when that truth is clearly apprehended and fully understood. The speculative and practical elements in human nature are so closely related that whatever affects the one is felt through the entire extent of the other. Every speculative error has its corresponding practical sin. False views of truth produce sinful practice in life. A man's duties arise from his relationship to God on the one hand, and to his fellows on the other; now let him have false conceptions of God, and erroneous views of human nature, and he will have correspondingly false views of his duties. By the metaphysical method Christian truth is presented in its great and guiding principles, its fundamental relations to human life are developed, so that instead of being indefinite and unpractical, it is

most definite in statement, dealing with truth in the exactest manner possible, and most practical in influence, bearing with concentrated force on the heart and conscience. It is probably its close consecutiveness in reasoning, its exactness in process of thinking, which distinguish the metaphysical method, that have occasioned the common opinion of its indefiniteness. Ordinary thinking is loose and inexact, conformable to general laws, but subject to no strict method, and no sooner is a stricter method introduced, than, in consequence of the mental effort required, it is pronounced indefinite, whereas the indefiniteness is characteristic of common and popular thought, and not of the metaphysical method. In popular thinking the concrete is considered of more importance than the abstract—the thing in bulk rather than the parts of which it consists. But now, what can be known of the concrete apart from abstraction? Except we know the parts what real knowledge can we have of the whole? Wholes certainly constitute something different from any of their parts taken separately; but the knowledge of a whole cannot be thorough unless we have an acquaintance with the parts of which it consists. It is not affirmed that there can be no knowledge whatever of wholes without an acquaintance with their parts, but simply that such knowledge cannot be considered thorough. It may be known that an object exists, that it is of given form, and may be put to certain uses; but if any or all of its constituents and their several qualities are unknown, and if there be equal ignorance of the law by which their proportions and combination in the particular are determined, the knowledge of that object is incomplete, and any attempt to discourse respecting it must be attended with considerable indefiniteness. Now what may thus be affirmed of the concrete in being may also be affirmed of the concrete in thought. The superficial aspects of truth may be perceived, some of its minor details may be apprehended, but this knowledge is incomplete and of necessity indefinite, while the fundamental principles by which minor details are brought into unity remain unapprehended. In metaphysical preaching it is sought to develop these fundamental principles, and thus manifest the unity of truth and its bearings upon all that is of highest interest in human life.

It is also urged against metaphysical preaching that elaborate processes of thought are not at all suitable for the pulpit; but to this it may be replied that the processes are not intended for the pulpit except in so far as they are required to make the results intelligible. The pulpit is designed for the results of thinking, and not so much for the processes by which the results are reached. It may be correct enough that most hearers are not capable of sustained attention to lengthy and elaborate argumentation; but there are few hearers whose attention may not be

sufficiently aroused by the statement of a fundamental truth, the development of a guiding principle in life, to follow so much of the thinking process, so much of the course of argument as may be requisite to place the truth in an intelligible light, and enforce the sanctions by which the authority of the principle is maintained; and this is all metaphysical preaching contemplates.

Metaphysical preaching then we consider not to be an indefinite and unintelligible sort of discourse altogether unsuitable for the pulpit, but an exact, definite, and proper method of conveying truth distinguished by a degree of abstraction and the predominance of reason—a method by which truth is presented in its essential elements and guiding principles, and by which a direct appeal is made to man's conscience, to his sense of right and obligation. This method neither undervalues nor despises any available aid by which truth can be brought into direct contact with the understanding and conscience. It has been affirmed that in discourse distinguished by the predominance of reason the imagination finds no place—that those ideal creations which are in themselves things of beauty, and often give clearness of outline to the truth, are excluded by the very nature of metaphysical preaching. Now this is a mistaken view. Perhaps brilliancy of imagination may seldom be combined with severity in reasoning, but that in preaching thus characterised the imagination finds no place is an opinion without foundation. The simple fact is in his preaching imagination is subject to the reason—its position is subordinate, not principal—so that it neither gives distinctive form nor characteristic name to the discourse; but there is a wide difference between subordination and exclusion, and this difference is completely ignored when it is maintained that the metaphysical method either despises or excludes the imagination. The operations of the mind are by this method placed in their proper relation of dependence, for undoubtedly the imagination ought to yield to the rule of reason, and men ought not to be captivated so much as convinced. In arresting attention and giving sharpness of outline to the truth the imagination may render effective service, and in so far its use is recognised and ample scope allowed for its action in metaphysical preaching.

It is also asserted that the predominance of reason, the elucidation of truth in its essential principles leads to cold and unimpassioned preaching—preaching void of pathos and genuine feeling. Now against a representation of this sort we protest, and protest because we deem it to be a misrepresentation. Passion in its purest and highest form is produced by a deep and living conviction of truth made known to us and apprehended by us. The more fully a man understands truth the more deeply will he be moved by the power which that truth possesses, and the emotion

thus experienced is of the most spiritual and elevated character, and free from the extravagancies generated by the predominance of sensuous and physical elements. Genuineness and depth of feeling cannot be gauged by elevation of voice or violence of gesticulation. The purest and loftiest emotion generally manifests itself with a profound solemnity that rebukes the turbulence of superficial excitement, and brings man face to face with the higher interests and realities of being. The true intensity of emotion is in proportion to its spirituality, and the more intense it becomes the less obtrusive are its manifestations. Depth of feeling forbids superficial agitation, and hence metaphysical preaching, instead of being devoid of genuine emotion, may be expected to palpitate and throb with the purest and most intense feeling—feeling under perfect control of reason, and only possible where truth in its fundamental and guiding principles is apprehended.

The metaphysical method allows a judicious consideration of the condition and circumstance of human life, and indeed of all aids by which truth can be brought into direct contact with the conscience of man. Nothing is despised, and nothing is set aside by the preacher adopting this method which is likely to help him in the accomplishment of his work; but he maintains the rule of reason, and whatever he introduces is introduced in subjection to the higher faculty, and with a view to produce a conviction of the truth of that particular principle which at the time he may be expounding and applying. Passing by many who have adorned the annals of the church since apostolic times we refer to the Apostle Paul himself as furnishing in his ministry an illustrious example of metaphysical preaching. There is no lack of emotion in him, the play of imagination is not wanting, there is also abundant reference to the varying condition and circumstance of human life, but supreme over all rules the reason, and the truth as elucidated by him in its essential principles dispels the darkness and removes the perplexities occasioned by the questions and controversies of the time. The partisan, the vehement and one-sided polemic never appear in Paul; when he touches a controversy the area it was supposed to cover becomes radiant with light, and the questions at issue are at once seen in their true bearings. He never trims or commits himself under the prejudice of partisanship to any side, but seeing some fundamental principle lying at the root of the discussion he adjusts the whole controversy. His writings furnish abundant evidence in support of the statements just made, but we need only refer to one instance recorded by his fellow-traveller, and another contained in his own letters. He was permitted a private audience with Felix, the governor having desired to hear concerning the "faith in Christ." But the apostle thus having opportunity to speak did not attempt to establish this

point against the Jews, or that against the Gentiles; he made no effort in the ordinary way of controversy to demonstrate the superiority of his teaching over the Jewish tradition or Gentile philosophy. The record of the discourse is brief but it indicates sufficiently the main characteristic and purpose of the address. He "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," elucidating the fundamental principles of the "faith in Christ" in relation to human life and destiny with particular application to the man he was then addressing. Again, the church at Ephesus was agitated by the controversies which resulted from the collision between Jewish and Gentile modes of thought, between the bondage of tradition and the liberty of the gospel. On furnishing Timothy with instructions for his guidance as overseer of the Ephesian church, the apostle refers to these perplexing and mischievous controversies; but he undertakes no formal refutation of the position assumed by either party. He simply announces and enforces as a principle of fundamental and vital importance, that "the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." Now here is developed a principle which if apprehended and embraced would hush into stillness the troubled sea of opinion in that Ephesian church. The design of the commandment was to create and maintain charity, and where any other result was produced the law was used unlawfully. The characteristics of metaphysical preaching—the predominance of the reasoning faculty, and the elucidation of truth in its essential principles—are conspicuous in Paul, and to the brief records of his discourses which have been transmitted to our times, both in regard to substance and style, as well as to his writings in general, we refer, for what we consider to be the highest and best form of metaphysical preaching.

We now propose considering some of the advantages of metaphysical preaching both to preachers and people. There is of course much advantage realised in common, but there are benefits on both sides sufficiently distinctive to admit of separate consideration.

The course of study required by metaphysical preaching leads to the development in the preacher of philosophical habits of thought. First may be named independence in thinking—what in popular language is styled thinking for one's-self. Now it must be acknowledged that truth is often accepted at second hand, and to some extent this is a necessity, but the necessity is not such as to preclude an examination of evidence, and a careful searching inquiry into the grounds upon which any doctrine or teaching may be based. Too frequently the prestige of antiquity, the support of ecclesiastical authority, and the prejudices of position and education, lead to the acceptance of dogma without any deep

and earnest conviction of its truth; and when this is the case, though the doctrine in question is true, yet it is inoperative, it is not a power in the heart making itself felt through all the life. There is also danger that in slavish deference to authority a man may wander from the truth, and enslaved himself he cannot liberate others. Independence in thinking allows nothing to be taken for granted except what is a necessity of thought and reasoning. Every point is carefully examined, and the investigation is continued until an ultimate position is reached, and the truth is fairly grasped and fully mastered. A habit like this is invaluable, for it not only prevents a slavish and superstitious submission to authority, it also prevents authority being undervalued and despised. There is just now a very great outcry against authority, especially in relation to religious belief. It might almost be supposed that in matters of faith man is incapable of deriving advantage from the past. In respect to other matters it is not questioned that one generation may contribute to the enrichment of its successors, and that benefit of this sort is cumulative; but in reference to religious belief it is almost made to appear that each generation must begin for itself, and, in fact, each man; and this is confounded with independence in thinking. But it is lawless rather than independent thought. An independent thinker never despises authority because it is presented as authority. He examines the grounds of it and if they are satisfactory he bows at once. Authority is no bug-bear to him, a thing that he obstinately refuses to face, and unceremoniously casts aside; he confronts it, and challenges it, and if its credentials are sufficient he accepts it and at once yields homage. Between a superstitious regard for authority and a superstitious dread of it there is little difference. An independent thinker avoids both extremes.

A second habit is comprehensiveness in thinking. Truth is contemplated under its varied aspects, and in its manifold relations. Isolation is never an end in philosophy. It may be requisite in the process of investigation, so that a particular phase of truth, or a particular principle may be more searchingly examined, but the ulterior design is that the general unity of truth may be more fully realised. There is never a thorough knowledge of truth unless its manifold relations be known in so far as they are knowable to man. The study demanded by metaphysical preaching leads to comprehensiveness in thinking, for the preacher contemplates the principle he wishes to enforce, not in itself alone; he surveys its ever widening ramifications until they are lost in the dimness which marks his limits of thought.

Along with independence and comprehensiveness in thinking may be named consecutiveness. Inquiry proceeds step by step, the first leading to the second, and the second requiring the first. *It is of im*portance that thinking proceed according to logical

sequence, and that the order of dependence be maintained from first to last. Exactness is not only desirable, but necessary, if a discourse has to be powerful to convince. Loose and unconnected thinking involves a great waste of energy, which, if wisely directed might effect important results. Rambling discourse may perhaps be agreeable to some persons, but unconnected with, and ungoverned by definite aim as it is, it is seldom or never profitable. It dissipates rather than invigorates. Consecutiveness in thinking gives strength to the thinker, power to his utterances, and commands for him the attention of his fellows. Now these habits of independent, comprehensive, and consecutive thinking, with other habits of almost equal value, are formed in the preacher by the course of study which metaphysical preaching requires.

Intimately connected with the habits just named, and of the utmost importance to the preacher, is a due appreciation of the relative value and importance of truth. The habits formed by metaphysical study of religious truth render the preacher judiciously appreciative, so that in all his discourses the relation of dependence is maintained, and a minor point is never invested with an undue interest, so as to overshadow the fundamental truth contained in the passage of Scripture selected for exposition. It is a serious defect in preaching when a subordinate position is discussed as though it were the main question at issue, and when the attention of hearers is directed to sundry details, which instead of aiding them to apprehend the truth—an end they might have promoted had they been kept in their proper place—prevent the understanding of it in consequence of the undue importance with which they are invested. Take for instance the passage already referred to in the First Epistle to Timothy, in which Paul states a guiding principle in relation to controverted points: "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." It has not been an uncommon thing in discussing this passage to give great prominence to the nature of the commandment, whereas the main thought evidently is, the purpose and design of the commandment, and this thought ought to occupy the leading place in the discussion. It is a still more serious defect in preaching when fanciful and foolish resemblances are traced which have no foundation either in reason or Scripture. The twenty-ninth verse in the first chapter of John's gospel is frequently abused in this way. The "Lamb" is considered representative of Christ, and in so far the view is correct, but it is often considered representative of him in a way that the Holy Ghost and the sacred writers never intended. All sorts of absurd resemblances are traced, and the real teaching of the passage is obscured. The righteousness of Christ is represented as the clothing of the saints, and here is found a resemblance to the wool of the lamb which is used in the manufacture of clothing. Those who have life in

Christ are said to have eaten of his flesh; and here is detected a resemblance to the flesh of the lamb which is used for food. Now, without using any stronger terms, we say that this is childish and absurd, a darkening of God's counsel, and trifling with a work the most sacred and responsible. Defects like these are excluded from metaphysical preaching. Its distinguishing characteristic is found in reaching and presenting truth in its essential and guiding principles. And in reasoning out a process to its ultimate result, preparatory to preaching, the preacher becomes increasingly appreciative of the relative value and importance of truth, so that he neither unduly elevates minor points, nor obscures the fundamental truth of the selected passage by absurd fancies of his own.

Metaphysical preaching determines to exactness and unity of method in sermonising. The sermon ought to constitute a unity, all its parts cohering in such order and relation as to form a complete whole. However valuable the materials of a sermon may be, unless they are united by some all-pervading principle, the sermon as a construction is defective, and violates the laws of order to which all well directed speech should strictly conform. A true and exact method is thoroughly conservative, admitting only what is required, and allowing of no greater expenditure of resource than is really necessary. Sometimes a preacher dispenses his stores with so prodigal a hand that his hearers become surfeited. He exhausts himself, and with no other result than that of exhausting his hearers. Whenever this occurs it indicates a want of method. The mind is defectively disciplined, the thinking is loose, the results of thinking are unmethodised, and by consequence they lose much of their power to produce lasting effect. In some sermons it seems as if the purpose of the preacher had been determined by the method, instead of the method by the purpose—as if the discourse had been constructed not with a view to accomplish some particular end, which end determined the method according to which the materials were arranged, but with a view to find out some end that might be accomplished. Now the purpose ought to be decided first, and then by its influence the method will be rendered definite and exact. There can be no true method undetermined by controlling purpose and aim. As metaphysical preaching is the elucidation of truth in its essential principles, which principles must of course be apprehended by the preacher before he can elucidate them, this mode of preaching will determine to exactness the construction of the sermon, and prevent that confusion amid which coherence and logical dependence disappear, and where for ought that is seen to the contrary, the first might have been last and the last first. The value of an exact and logical method to the preacher requires no comment, for it enables *him to discharge* the functions of his office with an ease and effec-

tiveness that cannot otherwise be secured. A method of this sort metaphysical preaching demands, and to orderliness and unity it necessarily determines.

The method of preaching discussed in this paper exercises a beneficial influence upon the general reading and studies of the preacher. There is a tendency to become desultory in reading and superficial in study; power of application, of intense and continuous thought is some time in being acquired; but the habits formed by the demands of the metaphysical method invariably lead to its acquisition. The mind becoming capable of endurance by the realisation of vigour and strength, delights in manly exercise, and rests not satisfied until thorough investigation has yielded all results that are possible. Reading and study are pursued with philosophic thoroughness and exactness, and made to contribute to the accomplishment of that work which specially belongs to the office of a preacher.

The advantage of metaphysical preaching to the church and the world is obvious from its power to convince. Conviction can only be produced by what to a man appears the truth. So long as a man does not apprehend truth as truth, it is powerless to influence him in his heart and life. Truth known makes man free. Illustrations and the various figures and adornments of speech may serve to arrest attention, but they have not power to convince; this belongs to truth alone, and there is danger of the minds of men being so amused or fascinated by the draperies of speech, that the truth is neglected. Truth often suffers in consequence of superfluous clothing. The grandeur of the attire diverts attention from the person. Metaphysical preaching develops truth as purely, simply, and pointedly as possible, with all the earnestness of living conviction in the preacher, and all the force of an exact logic from which there is no escape, save in that sullen and awfully obstinate resistance, of which, in the exercise of his liberty, man is capable. Grappling directly with the conscience, and bringing truth into the most intimate contact with the understanding, metaphysical preaching possesses power to convince in the highest degree, and herein lies a considerable advantage to the church and the world. We may refer to Paul's interview with Felix as a case in point. The apostle developed with metaphysical exactness the fundamental principles of the faith in Christ, as they were related to human life and destiny, and the heathen ruler quailed, as guilty men invariably do when the truth is presented in its simplicity and majesty, for it elicits a responsive utterance from their own conscience, and makes them stand self-condemned.

Laying the foundation of a religious life—as metaphysical preaching does, in deep and thorough conviction—it also fosters and develops an intelligent piety. Developing truth in its

essential and guiding principles, it reveals the rational foundations of religion, and vanquishes all doubt. It maintains no authority but the authority of truth. The man who under the influence of metaphysical preaching is determined to a religious life, is so determined because he is convinced that this is the manner of life he ought to pursue. He is not christian because he is born in a christian land, or of christian parents, but because he apprehends the truth, and by it is made free. The apprehension of truth in its intellectual substance, in its simplicity and purity, gives strength, stability, and symmetry to religious character. Passion is under the guidance of reason, practice is governed by an enlightened judgment and conscience. An intelligent piety is a piety in which the intellect bears rule, and of every form of religious life this is best fitted to meet and overcome the doubt and scepticism so prevalent in this age. And that metaphysical preaching aids the realisation of this higher form of religious life is evident from the fact that it presents the intellectual substance of truth, and adequately develops all that man requires for the perfection of his being; it also reveals the unity and oneness of truth, and the relation of Scriptural truth to all that is settled beyond controversy in the domains of science. Now if religion ought to be primarily grounded in the intellect, if the highest type of religious life be the intellectual, then certainly metaphysical preaching will be a benefit to the people that may be favoured with it, for of all methods of preaching it has most direct relation to the intellect, and leads to the highest ranges of thought.

Deep and thorough conviction, intellectuality in religious life, constitute the strongest safeguard against extreme religious sensationalism. The sensational element in human nature may, under judicious guidance, be advantageously employed in awakening men to serious thought, and thus be conducive to reformation in life; but it cannot be regarded in any other light than deplorable that there should be so much countenance afforded in the churches to effort of an extremely sensational character. The ordinary resources and agencies of the church are considered inadequate. There must be something out of the common way, something to astound and meet the demands of vitiated tastes and of a prurient curiosity. All this appears nearly akin to the scheming adopted in theatrical management. We must have services conducted in odd places by odd persons, who delight in odd cognomens, and who indulge in extravagancies, which, instead of convincing men of their spiritual needs, merely amuse them, and dissipate their minds instead of arousing their consciences and concentrating their attention upon the solemn truth affecting human destiny. Now all this we regard with sorrow. It seems far beneath the dignity of the Church's position and work to resort to schemes of this sort. The excitement

thus created is unhealthy and mischievous. It seldom if ever results in change of heart and life, for it either speedily passes away, leaving the subject of it more fully under the rule of evil, or it develops into fanaticism. Metaphysical preaching furnishes a safeguard against this extreme sensationalism, for it gives to truth its rightful place, and panders not to the lower tastes of men, but seeks to evoke in them higher aspirations. It cultivates a love, not for superficial excitement, but for the truth, that by it the condition and experience of the higher life may be realised.

Metaphysical preaching deserves not the disparagement with which it too frequently meets, for though in its higher form it may be possible to very few, yet in so far as it is possible it ought to be cultivated by all. While every one strives in his own order to serve his day and generation according to the will of God, let him also "covet earnestly the best gifts."

A. J.

ART. IX.—PITT, SHERIDAN, AND FOX.

THE younger Pitt was an orator by discipline and by inheritance. He was early a thorough master of the Greek and Latin tongues. He was therefore a thorough master of all those great oratorical achievements whose fame shall survive when the Greek and Latin tongues shall be undecipherable. They formed, we are told, his favourite study. He translated them, retranslated them, analysed, and got them by heart. Early associations tended to strengthen and confirm the effects of physical heritage and educational training. It could not have well been otherwise with Chatham's son. The fame of that great man had penetrated into the nursery of Hayes. Of the eldest son's appreciation we know nothing. The eldest son was no genius. But biography still loves to linger on the strangely precocious interest which the second son took in his father's renown. Before other boys had left school, he was holding mock debates at a London tavern, and astonishing men who lived to hear his great parliamentary triumphs, and to repeat that his great parliamentary triumphs did not surpass the tentative effusions of the amateur. Long before he scandalised the Doctors of Golgotha by presuming to set up for Cambridge, his form was familiar to the starers of the House of Commons. Day by day the young athlete was to be seen in

the gallery, exercising his memory, and practising his discrimination by hearing and answering in his own mind the great geniuses of debate. It was no wonder, when he entered the arena in earnest, the general cry was that a champion had taken the field. His first triumph came with his first speech. A hundred eyes strove to trace in the features and the manner of the young orator the old familiar lineaments of the sire who slept in Westminster. A hundred memories recalled the tones which had more than once roused the chivalry of England to action. 'It is not a chip of the old block,' said Burke, enthusiastically, 'it is the old block himself.'

Pitt soon displayed qualities the very opposite to those of his rival, Fox. He was shy and formal. His manners were stiff and reserved. A great deal was due to the circumstances under which he entered life. He had passed from college to the cabinet, and he brought to the cabinet something of that self-complacency and formality which, somehow or other, is always contracted by certain natures in the precincts of the college. Even in his most relaxed moments his most indulgent companions were nettled to find in the friend, as in the minister, that academical starchness and that academical affection which dons and tutors love to see in their undergraduates. Among his enemies, or, properly speaking, among his opponents, it operated to his disadvantage. Men who were accustomed to the genial familiarity and hearty goodfellowship of Fox, mistook his shyness for cunning, and denounced his formality as hauteur. He was, they said, the man of ancient Carthage. He was the man of modern Italy. He was anything but an Englishman.* Both the eloquence and the lives of the two statesmen present a very marked contrast. Pitt was cold and artificial. In his oratory, as in his demeanour, everything bespoke a temperament well under command. There are no sallies of passion, no vehement apostrophes. When he attempted to be earnest, he generally ended in being dignified. When he attempted to be warm, his warmth never exceeded the bounds of the most careful good breeding. His simplicity was studied. His energy was an educated one. His style, like the style of Fox, verbose, but verbose rather by redundancy than by repetition, without pomp, with few flowers of rhetoric and few images, was exactly the style to suit the nature of the man, well regulated, firm, and reasonable. It was by the aid of this style, we suspect, that he was enabled to excel in two very distinct and even opposite qualifications, in the art of amplification and the art of suppression. When he would be explicit, he unfolded his statements with perfect lucidness and distinctness. When he wished to be reserved, he did not suppress

* Godwin.

his language, indeed, but he concealed his meaning under the semblance of candour, and gratified the curiosity of his hearers under the semblance of satisfying it. He certainly had not the commanding brilliancy of his father, but his language was more correct, and his reasoning more methodical. It is denied that he is argumentative. There is no doubt Fox, in the gross, is superior to him in the art of reply. But in Pitt it was not so much inability as disinclination. His measured style was not accommodated to the colloquial manner of Fox. But that he could be argumentative, could take his opponent's objections, arrange them in formal order, and reply to them one by one with masterly succinctness, is manifest to any one who will take the pains to read his speech on the discussion of the Preliminary Articles of Peace with France, Spain, and Austria, February 21, 1783; his speech on the abolition of slavery, April 2, 1792; and his speech on Fox's resolution about the pacification with France, May 30, 1794. He indulged in none of the fanciful imagery of Burke, and evidently thought it unsuited to the business of debate. One of his bitterest and happiest castigations was extorted by the imaginative exuberance of Burke's speech on the King's address, December 6, 1782, and may be found in his own speech in reply. Sheridan's gay and lively manner was peculiarly distasteful to him. He had chastised Burke. He took occasion to offer a dignified rebuke to Sheridan. The theatre, he told him, was the fit place for the gay effusions of his fancy, his turns, and his epigrammatic points. Let him reserve them for the stage, and on the stage they would doubtless have the good fortune *sui plausus gaudere theatri.* The reproof was a happy one, but it is remembered, unfortunately, by the far happier counter-retort which it called up. 'Flattered and encouraged by the Right Honourable gentleman's encomiums on my talents,' said the wit, 'if ever I again engage them in the composition he alludes to, I may be led by an act of presumption to attempt an improvement upon one of Ben Jonson's best characters, the character of the Angry Boy in the *Alchemist.*' Sheridan himself was far superior to Pitt in what may be called the Comedy of Debate. Indeed, if the perfection of his oratory is to be estimated by the number of its several accomplishments, he might be pronounced superior to Pitt in the gross. No single rhetorical beauty is in one place or another absent from it. The ridiculous, the pathetic, and the sublime, each reached a climax in him. Yet Sheridan's reputation never was and never can be placed on a level with Pitt's. The truth is, he resembled an ancient Pentathlete. Skilled in all the five exercises, he was superior in all to mere amateurs, but inferior in each to professionals. His information was limited. His classical learning was below his general information. The powers of his mind were extensive, but they exceeded its acquisitions.

He was accused of displaying too much wit. Yet those who knew him have since declared that no one came at their wit more laboriously. Whole mornings were secretly dedicated to it, apparently surrendered to the lazy sleep of fashion; and the happy epigram or lively repartee of to-day was probably manufactured a week, or even a month before its delivery. Some one has mentioned him in the same breath with the Grecian Hyperides. And perhaps it would be difficult to give his characteristics in fitter words than those applied to Hyperides by Longinus. 'There is an exhaustless fund of wit about him, a vein of piquant satire, a natural grace, a skilfulness of irony, jests not clumsy or loose, after the manner of the old Attic writers, but natural and easy; a ready talent for ridicule, a deal of comic point, conveyed in a style of well-managed pleasantry; and in all things a winning gracefulness that is almost inimitable. It is plain, too, that he has composed some of his discourses in a style more like poetry than prose.' 'Sheridan's,' said Burke, as if in imitation of Longinus, 'is a middle style between prose and poetry.'

In every way dissimilar to Pitt was his great antagonist Fox. Pitt was studious and abstemious. Fox loved dissipation, and hated application. Pitt was ambitious, and was industrious to realise his ambition. Fox was ambitious, but it was the only passion he took least pains in gratifying. He loved popularity, yet he did little to win it, and was perpetually doing much to risk it. He disguised no vice, though a little disguise might have saved him much obloquy. Void of design, and impatient of culture, his parts were natural, and his success was due only to his parts. As a statesman, in private virtues he was of the race of the Whartons and Rochesters, and the last of his race. Since his time no minister has left behind him such details of extravagance and dissoluteness. That he was the best-natured man alive must be placed, however, as a balance in his favour. Men who hated him as a politician, could not deny their heart to the man. As a politician, too, it was difficult to hate him. All that generosity and good-humour which fascinated in his private life and among his private associates clung to him in politics. He had no spleen. He bore no ill-will; none that an evening with *Don Quixote* and Mrs. Armistead could not remove. It was emphatically true of him that the sun did not go down on his wrath. In the hearty enthusiasm of a moment of admiration he would more than once have carried off Pitt to Brookes'. When the philosophic labours of a lifetime had jangled the fine-strung sensibilities of Burke, the statesman wept, while the philosopher pouted. Outside the House his popularity, though sometimes endangered, was scarcely less. His vices, we suspect, operated upon his character among his cotemporaries as did those of his ancestor Charles II. They were

vices of the heart rather than of the head, originating in indolence rather than in malignancy. Hence his friends pardoned the man they had not courage to condemn. They overlooked the rake in the statesman; and while he disgraced the metroplis with scenes as vicious as any that were ever enacted on Tower-hill or Bartholomew Fair, they still clung to the champion, in whom they realised the cause that had bled with Hampden on the field, and with Sidney on the scaffold. They never found him wanting. His exertions were quite commensurate with his idleness. His activity equalled his sloth. If he gave his nights to champagne and ombre, he gave his days to the serfs of Africa and the Helots of America. He was not a successful man. His fondness for play was scarcely surpassed by his fondness for politics. Yet in play he ended as a beggar, and for his success in politics, it is enough to say that, with the exception of eleven months, he was never out of opposition.

If the exhibition of emotion be the test of sincerity, and the exhibition of sincerity the test of a great orator, Fox was one of the greatest orators that ever lived. The hurried sentence, the involuntary exclamation, the vehement gesture, the start, the agitation, everything was indicative of that kind of eloquence that comes from the heart, and goes to the heart. His tongue faltered, his voice grew stifled, and his face bathed with tears. Pitt lost by the contrast in his demeanour. Those who watched the motions of his great rival saw in the stiff unbending figure, the monotonous inflection, and the solemn posture, the formal grace of a passionless automaton. They matched the earnestness, the animation, the enthusiasm of the one, against the gravity, the smoothness, and the plausibility of the other, and they denied that there could be warmth where there was so little fire. In taking into consideration, however, the superiority of Fox in this respect, it must be remembered that his oratory was cradled and nursed in opposition. The effect of such a position on parliamentary oratory is by no means slight. His independence of situation imparts to the speaker an independence of tone. No official reserve is there to chill his animation or to curb his tongue. Horace Walpole has remarked, in one of his Memoirs, that Marchmont in opposition and Marchmont in place were two very different speakers. The warmth and fire of his elocution when out of office disappeared, and left him without a single redeeming grace in office. Something of the same test must be applied in a comparison of Fox with Pitt. In logic, in all the formalities of eloquence, in all those points, in fact, where his nature and habits would suggest an inferiority, he was inferior to Pitt.

British Quarterly Review.

BRIEF NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Pilot of the Galilean Lake. By THOMAS LOWE. Third thousand, revised and enlarged. London: W. Lister, Sutton Street.

THIS captivating little volume is an exposition, and something more. While the main points of the Gospel narrative on which it is based are skilfully developed, manifold other kindred or suggested topics are brought within scope of the author's pen. His mind being discursive rather than analytic, no one point of thought is discussed at any length; but with strength and swiftness of intellectual pinion he ranges over numerous subjects in a brief period. His choice and extensive reading is here turned to good account. A great variety of apt and beautiful quotation in prose and verse adorns these pages. The style, which is of tropical luxuriance,—blazing with the fervours of an excited imagination,—is nevertheless strong and pure; and the sentiment throughout is sound and evangelical. We commend this book as being well fitted to foster the nobler impulses of the soul, and to advance the interests of practical godliness.

The Peerless Glory of the Cross. By THOMAS LOWE. Second edition. London: W. Lister, Sutton Street.

THE fundamental verities of the Gospel—"Christ and him crucified"—are here set forth in highly imaginative and impassioned speech, illustrated by a numerous array of striking and beautiful facts and fancies.

Closet Prayer. By the Rev. T. WHITTAKER. London: W. Lister, Sutton Street.

WHILE our Puritan fathers and some of the early Methodists went to an extreme in the amount of time spent in private devotion, we probably go to the opposite and more dangerous extreme of living our religious life almost exclusively outside the closet. How to balance our public with our private duties, our duties in the Church and in society with the claims of the closet, is, for the present day at least, one of the most difficult questions of spiritual casuistry. This question, however, cannot be settled on general grounds; every man must settle it for himself, with special reference to his own condition, and on his own responsibility.

In the small volume before us, while private prayer is enforced by Scripture precept, and illustrated by Scripture example, it is also shown to be in unison with the instincts of our spiritual nature, and that the prompting of these instincts to draw near to God in private should be regarded as the voice of God's own Spirit, and obeyed. This duty is further shown to be of primary obligation, and to be alike obligatory on all Christians, inasmuch as it is essential to a healthy religious character. Finally, private prayer is shown to be intimately connected with ministerial success, and with revivals of religion generally. We hope this well-timed little book will be extensively read, and its solid and judicious counsels laid to heart.

THE

CHRISTIAN AMBASSADOR

ART. I.—THE CONSERVATISM OF NATURE; OR, LIFE *VERSUS* DENUDATION.—No. I.

FROM THE STAND-POINT OF COMMON OBSERVATION.

FROM the above heading it will be seen that we claim not the power of scientific classification, or scientific detail. The character we assume is that of common observers. But even observers are held responsible in their relations and deference to scientific truth; a responsibility best fulfilled, we opine, in the estimation of Mr. Huxley, by profound reverence and profound silence. Should we be wanting in profundity of reverence and silence in his presence, the probability is we shall be reminded of our ignorance, and told, as he told a member of the British Association for the advancement of Science, that we are not competent to deal with the subject. Now, where right thinking and acting is demanded, the power of thought and of action is acknowledged, and, as a necessary sequence, the right of free speech follows. Mr. Huxley, as well as the "Observer," is amenable to the laws, conditions, and moral requirements which the right of free speech implies and imposes, especially the moral requirement of humility, for that is demanded of, and needed by, all; by the "savan" as well as the ploughman. The "Savan" may arise far above the difficulties and mysteries that puzzle the "ploughman," but it is only to come in contact with difficulties and mysteries more numerous and of a higher and more subtle kind. For as we near the infinite the abysses are deeper, the mountains higher, and the only way for even the philosopher to lay the demons that arise around him is, to take his stand on the known, the practical, and the good, and to bow, in humble reverence, before the ultimate, the infinite, just as the ploughman bows to facts which to him are equally mysterious and authoritative.

Of all the subjects which the mind of man has investigated, or can investigate, perhaps the science of Geology requires the greatest amount of that patience and candour, that prudence and humility, which ought to characterise all honest truthseekers, arising partly from the comparatively recent period during which attention has been given to geological investigation in the true spirit of the inductive philosophy; partly from the transmutation of many of its so-called facts into fiction; and partly from the wide and almost illimitable field which it opens up to all minds given to speculate and theorise. But if the scientific and theoretical in geology blend with and take root in the practical, and the practical rises to the platform of the scientific, if a man only infers from, and teaches to others, that which he knows, even geology, in its facts and bearings, may be successfully and usefully studied, not only by the "savan," but by all those who are possessed of no other philosophy higher than that of common observation and experience.

The facts intended to be discoursed of in these papers, "The Power of Life, *versus* the Power of Denudation," like all other facts, lead to an infinite variety of speculation if pursued to their ultimates; speculation in which the "village swain" cannot advance many degrees beyond the facts themselves. But as to whether life exists at *this* point, or has been destroyed by denuing influence, at *that* point the swain can decide just as well as the "savan." The question is not respecting the philosophy of agents, but their operative results, and their operative results at a point which he *sees* and *knows*. For whether a stone, or a rock, in the bed of a river is the seat on which is perched a fresh water shell, or covered by a vegetable covering, or whether it has been denuded from its original condition and form, are questions which the common observer is competent to decide; and as to surety of results, we hold that this power to observe is all the skill required in relation to the question in hand by the mode of investigating it which we propose. For in order to secure competency and surety of results, we purpose to limit our statements to investigations, and facts observed within a district well-known to us, viz.: To the conservatism and balance of nature, as exhibited on the face of the carboniferous system as existing and developed within the water-sheds of the rivers Wear and Tees. Our chief reason for thus limiting our statements is that we have never thoroughly investigated the existence and operations of animal and vegetable life in any of the more recent systems and series of existing strata. We believe that the phenomena of vegetable and animal life, as far as our own country is concerned, are much the same to what they are the wide world over; but we limit our reasonings and remarks to the facts which have come under our own observation in the streams and valleys and mountains of our own locality. We pass, also, without

remark the operations of the sea as a denuder, knowing little by accurate observation of its doings, and perhaps less of its philosophy. But the foundations and bulwarks of our native hills we have examined, and as far as the natural influences now operating upon and amongst them go, we find the faith of our childhood confirmed, and believe that in their present form, without any sensible variation, worthy of note, that even geologically they are everlasting, except He who is the source of all law and the creator of all systems in the exercise of his power shall say, "Let there be death." We almost fancy we see the smile of sarcasm playing on the countenance of a "professional," should he condescend to read such remarks as the foregoing; a compliment that we trust we shall appreciate at its true value, and one we are afraid we shall only be too ready to return. But we would remind the scoffer that the remarks just made relate more to our faith than to our philosophy. We believe that, in the district named above, the influences of life and destruction are so finely balanced, that separated from all foreign influences they would continue for ever, that is, reasoning from the actual to the probable, for if a state of things can endure one thousand years, why not ten thousand, or for ever, if the present balance of natural forces endures? But when we reason, as we sometimes do, from the possible to the actual, and prophesy the future from the past, we see at once that by a slow (it may be imperceptible) sinking of the sea shore, or the setting in of a "Glacier frost," all the sanctity and beauty of our mountain home may be invaded, and destroyed, and sunk in the ocean, to be no more seen, except some last memento of it floating past on an iceberg. But our faith is firm in the continuance of the present balance of nature, and, therefore, hopeful of the future, though, as will be perceived, like the faith of all non-professionals, it includes a great deal more than our knowledge has attained unto. But for the present we leave the subject of Faith, and proceed to

A Statement of the Case.

If one position is assumed in geological science with greater confidence than another, it is that all the sedimentary strata of the globe have been derived from the primary, and that the present agents of denudation have been the excavators, separators, conveyers, and depositors of them in their present position and condition. This is the position assumed by the moderates, while the advanced geologists contend that these agents are working as powerfully, universally, and systematically as ever they did in the past, or as a recent writer (after enumerating all the denuding influences referred to) says, "To what, it may be asked, does all this lead? If such a constant destruction of the land be a part

of the system of nature, it necessarily follows that if her laws continue to endure, the whole of our present continents must in time disappear under the surface of the sea. Undoubtedly to that, and to no other conclusion must we arrive; but such a transference of the land which now rises above the surface of the sea is in perfect accordance with what geology tells us has been the economy of nature in times past. All the stratified masses of which the crust of the earth is composed, however high their position may now be, must at one time have been at the bottom of the sea; and the materials of which they are composed must have constituted the component parts of other rocks, which, in a former condition of the earth's surface, must have been acted upon and abraded by similar agents. In every great group of strata we find beds composed of large water-worn fragments, materials supplied, most probably, by rivers which had a rapid descent to the sea; but as such water-courses form but a small proportion to those which traverse the low and level countries, and carry only the finer particles to the sea, so we find that the beds of conglomerates bear only a small proportion to those strata the materials of which are in a comminuted state—an additional fact in support of the doctrine, that the formation of strata in past times took place under circumstances analogous to those which are now in progress, that is, that the laws of the material world have continued unaltered. But renovation as well as decay is a part of the economy of nature, and the subterranean forces which raised our present continents may, in after ages, repeat the process, and other Alps and other Andes may be produced from the materials which are now washed from our shores, and are now accumulating in the unfathomable depths of the ocean."—English Cyclopœdia, article *Alluvium.*

We have given the above extract from a work distinguished for moderation in the statement of scientific theory and teaching, and what we have now quoted may be taken as a fair and proper statement of the subject under discussion, and though it may appear rather inconsistent with the character we have assumed, *i.e.*, common observers, and an apparent deviation from the matter of fact and practical character of these papers, yet before entering more directly into the subject, we offer a few objections to the theory included in the paragraph just quoted.

Firstly,—This theory declares that the destruction of the present state of things is inevitable, and consequently that existence, organic and un-organic, sentient and rational must perish; that the security, order, and harmony of the present cannot be perpetuated into the future, for as our sea beach has been raised four feet in the present historical era, it necessarily follows that, like others of the geological eras of the past, it will be raised 4,000 *feet in the* future, or vice versa. As earthquakes have shaken our

earth, and in some localities rent it asunder, and engulphed cities with their inhabitants, shaken continents, and overturned mountains even in the present age, so will it be in the future; our present "Alps" must give place to "Alps higher still." A few volcanoes exist which have covered cities, mountains, and filled up valleys with their fiery lava. As this has occurred in the past so will it be in the future. They will deposit traps, basalts, even thicker and wider-spread than "The Great Whin Sill." Now all these things are possible, and may be, but are we sure that they will be? Are we quite sure that the logic by which we arrive at these conclusions is irrefragable?

Secondly,—This theory reaches certain results by reasoning from data that are at best only probable. The past and the present may be the true interpreters of the future, or they may not; the known may be a prophecy of the unknown, or it may not; chaos may be the successor of order, or it may not; the present relation of law to law, as to equality of power and results, may be the same, or it may not. Has it been so in the past? The present balance of nature may be complete and perfect, or it may not. Has it been demonstrated that it is not complete? Who can affirm this fairly?

Thirdly,—This theory ignores the principle of design which is manifested in nature, and the fact to which her operations seems to point; not to an endless change, but to a definite end. Do not the past changes of the globe point to the present and the permanent? do not the lower developments of life indicate the higher? did not the deposition and existence of coal indicate its use and present applications? did not the stores of the useful and precious metals indicate the coming wants and applications of civilised life? did not the creation and existence of the diamond and ruby indicate that there was a "fair one" to come whose arms and forehead they should adorn, and when this Queen of Beauty, in company with the "Antropological Savan" has actually walked on to, and has taken possession of the stage of the globe, are we not warranted in asserting that the fulness of geological time has now come, and that the great end of creation, as it regards the physical condition and configuration of the world, is now attained, viz:—That it is now a fit and proper habitation for man to dwell in? Talk of the formation of more limestone, coal, freestone, &c., where are the proofs that any more are needed? talk of "Alps" over and above those we now have, how many precious lives have been sacrificed in exploring those we have, and still they are comparatively unknown? Surely when the "Antropologist" has been developed, and such a profusion of subjects provided by nature for his investigation and the exercise of his philosophical

powers, surely she may then cease her operations and developments, and let the present good endure.

Fourthly,—This theory is false, inasmuch as it is a partial statement of those facts which nature has presented to us for investigation. Nature denudes, but nature also renovates, and renovates not by death but life; not by the predominance of one or more forces, but by force neutralising force, law limiting law. We have heard a great deal said about the "balance of power" as it stands related to the interests of liberty, not only, in Britain, but in Europe; a state of things on which the interests of true freedom depends far more than on the predominance of an individual or a faction. As it is in the social and national, so is it in the material world; permanent order can only exist and be realised by the proper adjustment of law to law, force to force, which adjustment now exists and is distinguished by those who recognise and believe in the "Balance of Nature;" and it is this subject which we intend to dwell upon in the following articles, in which we purpose to give facts and reasons to prove that the productions and influences of life are equal to, if not superior, as neutralisers to the doings of denudation or death. An advocate who only states half the truth of his case, and only brings into court part of the evidence which he knows is available, may be a good advocate in a forensic sense, and may be faithful to the interests of his client, but not to the interests of truth and justice; for it is only by a full statement of evidence for and against that a true decision can be come to, and it is only by true decisions that the interests of truth and justice can be upheld. That scientific geologists are true in their efforts to establish the interests of their clients or theories, we doubt not; that is, if a statement of evidence in their favour, and a witholding of that which is against them can be called true. But are they equally true to nature or that power which they profess implicitly to obey? If so, why do we hear so much about denudation, the destructive element, and so little about life, the power that creates and restores? Why such a straining to make the present the measure of the past, and to persuade men that if they can only swallow the camel of the present, they need not strain at swallowing anything the past can present? If modern geologists are the men of science they profess to be, they know far more of the influence of vegetable and animal life on the surface of the globe than we do; but why do they not state it in its proper relations? We admit that life is often discussed as one of the great and manifold phenomena of existence, but scarcely ever is it referred to as a neutraliser of the effects of denudation. We have "Elements of Geology," "Principles of Geology," "Geological Text Books," and "Observers" for every

gradation and class of students; but the "Conservatism of Nature," as exhibited and established by the facts of geological science, is a book yet to be written, that is as far as our knowledge of geological literature goes. Is this fair? is this honest?

From the above implication there is one name which we desire to shield and honour, that of the late Dr. Conybeare. He did not write a book on the subject indicated, yet he left an important protest in the introduction of that invaluable work, "The Geology of England and Wales." Our attention was first directed to this protest by a writer in the "English Cyclopœdia," article, "Surface of the Earth," who says that the statements therein contained have not received that attention from succeeding geologists which they deserve; and so valuable do we consider them to all men who do not want to discard common sense in the pursuit of truth, that we present them in full: "We have finally to examine the local changes which have taken place subsequently to this last great and general convulsion, and which still continue to take place under the influence of the order of causes at present in actual operation. In these we may often observe a balanced and compensated effect of destruction and renovation; for instance, in the most powerful of these causes, the agency of the sea upon the coasts, we find the head-lands and projecting promontories undermined and washed away by the waves, towards which their sections present in consequence scars of mural cliffs; but the materials thus absorbed are usually thrown up again, and constitute extensive tracts of newly formed marsh-land along the less exposed points of the coast; in parts also forming new banks and shoals in the adjoining channel of the sea. The agency of rivers is of a similar description; these, when their higher branches assume the force of wintry torrents, carry away sometimes in considerable quantity the looser materials of the soil through which they rush; but they deposit these materials again in the formation of alluvial flats and deltas near their mouths. The action of atmospheric causes, the frost rifting and detaching portions of the outer surfaces of rocks, and the rain by washing the finer portions away, either contribute to the agency of the torrents, or accumulate the fragments detached, in a slope or talus of debris at the foot of the hill whence they are derived.

"These actions, however, appear to be circumscribed within very narrow limits; over a great part of the earth's surface the influences of these wasting causes is absolutely null, the mantle of green-sward that invests it being an effectual protection. The burrows of the original Britons, after a lapse of certainly little less, and in many instances probably more than two decades of centuries, retain very generally all the pristine sharpness of their outline; nor is the slight fosse that sometimes surrounds them in any degree

filled up. Cases, then, which in two thousand years have not affected in any perceptible manner these small tumuli, so often scattered in very exposed situations over the crest of our hills, can have exerted no very great influence on the mass of those hills themselves in any assignable portion of time, which even the imagination of a theorist can allow itself to conceive; and when circumstances are favourable to a greater degree of waste, still there is often a tendency to approach a maximum at which further waste will be checked; the abrupt cliff will at last become a slope, and that slope become defended by its grassy coat of proof. It should appear that even the actions of the sea, certainly the most powerful and important of all those we have surveyed, has a similar tendency to impose a limit to its own ravages. It has obviously, in many instances, formed an effectual barrier against itself by throwing up shingle banks and marsh lands in the face of cliffs, against which it once beat; and after the destruction has been carried to a certain point, it appears necessary from the mode of action (excepting where very powerful currents interfere) that the very materials resulting from the ruin should check its further increase; even where these currents exist these also have a tendency to throw up barriers of shingle in their eddy. Historical records, and the very nature and physical possibilities of the case, alike compel us to dissent entirely from the crude and hasty speculations which would assign to the causes now in action the power of producing any very material change in the face of things; and which would refer to these alone, acting under their present forces, the mighty operations which have formed and modified our continents." Outlines of Geology of England and Wales. Introduction, paragraph 12, pages 31-33.

The above extract contains statements and facts which claim the attention of every scientific observer, and if they have not received that attention which the writer before referred to thinks they merit, yet we hesitate not to say that in the future due attention will be given, if not to the particular paragraphs quoted, yet to the facts therein announced and pointed out. Facts may be discarded at the present, but they will rear their heads and voices in the future. The voice of Dr. Conybeare may not be listened to nor even heeded amidst the din of the professors who are propounding speculations which the doctor we think justly pronounces "crude and hasty," but perhaps there may yet come a calm when the small still voice of truth may again be heard, and Dr. Conybeare yet gain attention.

It will be perceived that Dr. Conybeare refers to all the chief agents of denudation; not only to rivers, &c., but to the sea as well. And his remarks on the sea we recommend to the attention of all those who live on, or near to the sea-board. If his remarks

are true, that there is a tendency in the ocean to neutralise its own effects, and that even its destructive powers tend to conservatism, sure we are that if destruction cannot be predicted of the sea in its own domain, it cannot be so of the agents operating on the land; at least, this holds true in the district before named, and in which our observations have been made, for here vegetable life *in its grassy coat of proof*, and its other natural allies, are all that is necessary to check the ravages of the invading foe, and under the shadow and protection which the name of Conybeare gives, we purpose, in the succeeding papers, to show that Life is equal to Death, and, as a neutraliser, it is all that is necessary to save the world from the ravages of the denuding agent referred to, or that the present results of nature's operations are *Conservative.*

GEORGE RACE.

ART. II.—THE TWO HELPERS.

"For we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God."—Rom. viii. 24-27.

HOPE is a treasure, a gem of incalculable value. To him who has it, it is of more worth than an extensive estate is to another man who has reached the top of his ambition, and who sickens with disgust over what he has obtained. Of earthly good, the hope is frequently better than the acquirement. The mind nauseates in possession what it yearned after in prospect. It is said that distance lends enchantment. The far-off mountains are blue, and poetic, and grand. Come into close quarters with them, the illusion vanishes and the grandeur is qualified. So, blessings between which and us, time and space and difficulties and contingencies intervene, seem very desirable. Their value is enhanced by the adventure required to come at them, by the difficulties to be conquered in order to realise them. The mind, putting a fictitious worth on them, springs after them with an ardour corresponding to its own estimate rather than commensurate with their

real value. Possession corrects the false calculations. The fruition is not answerable to the expectation. It is often found that hope yields more enjoyment than is to be found in realisation. When Alexander, on one occasion, had divided the spoils of a victory to his officers and men, forgetting his own share (as generous minds are apt to do), some one asked him what he had reserved for himself. His reply was—hope. Future conquests would yield him his portion. The man who has hope has a sure source of enjoyment, and a spring of activity within him. Even if it fails of realisation, it is a thing of great interest in the meantime. True as this philosophy is concerning secular good, we cannot apply it to the hope of heaven. We must just reverse it in respect of heaven, the possession of which will far surpass the prospect, and the fruition overswell the hope. We cannot put an over-estimate on the happiness in reversion for the saints. Earthly good is fallacious and fleeting, liable to many accidents and to much alloy. Heavenly good is pure and permanent. The hope of heaven is a richer blessing than the highest earthly possessions.

The first two verses of the section under review are about hope. The first clause of verse 24, "For we are saved by hope," is thought by some to mean that hope saves us by supplying motivity to action and effort. If we gave up hope we would give up endeavour after its object, and relapse into utter indifference and inactivity. This is good philosophy and is worthy of our attention, whether it explains this passage or not. Hope is saving, inasmuch as it is buoyant and prompts to persevering endeavours. Let us illustrate. Say a ship at sea has sprung a leak, and the water is gaining fast in the hold. The pump must be vigorously worked or certain destruction awaits the vessel and all on board. Now, it will materially affect the result whether hope is entertained or not. Despair may sink her, when the elements could not do so, if vigorously contended against. Hope may save her, when the elements left to their own course would not do so. Some of the crew pronounce it useless to try to save her, and affirm there is no hope. Happily, there are others of more hopeful hearts, who believe it possible to bring her into harbour. The pumps are worked accordingly with brawny arms incessantly, by hopeful hands relieving each other at intervals, till at length after a protracted struggle they gain their point and land in safety. Now, what saved that vessel? The unremitting activity at the pumps. Certainly vigourous pumping stood in palpable relation to the result. But you will touch the truth more deeply and philosophically if you say she was saved by hope. The pumping kept the vessel afloat. But what was it that kept the pumps going? The men's arms. But what was it that kept the men's arms in motion? It was hope combined with the love of life, and you may add, with trust in God, to make it more

complete. Since hope is the life and spring of active effort, it has a saving power in such a case. Some explain this clause to such a sense as this. We admit the philosophy. We doubt the exegesis.

Another way which we think preferable in explanation is, to give its import thus:— *We are not saved yet, but have to be saved.* Our salvation is a future and prospective affair, not entirely, but chiefly so. It is a process, having been initiated and waiting its completion at a future period. We are saved by hope, or *in* hope, as it would bear reading. There is no separate word answering to either *by* or *in*. An inflection of the substantive indicates it and is used either way. The word *hope* is in what scholars call the dative of the manner, and not the dative of the means. We are saved hope-wise, but not in point of fact. So a sick man may have health in hope, when he is anything but well. So a poor man may have wealth in hope, if he has good ground of expectation, and a fair prospect of being rich at a specified time. If after three or four years an estate must fall to him, and it is clear that he will be rich, then he is already rich in hope, though in fact poor. He may be struggling on from hand to mouth, making each day meet its demands by dint of a penurious strain which he is obliged to put on, and which others, who have no such hope as he has, have no need to exercise. His next neighbour, who has no hope like his, has a better weekly income, and lives on better fare. Still we look upon the man with a wealthy prospect as being really the rich man. The case of a poor heir is exactly the thing to explain this passage. The context furnishes us with this key of explanation, as there is so much said in it about adoption and heirship. From the fourteenth verse on to this point, "children," and "heirs," and "adoption," are terms turning up. Who does not know that the heir, during his minority, is often kept bare by his father's prudence and anxiety for his welfare! Though he is lord of all, prospectively, the servants of his father's household may stand quite abreast of him in outward appearance, and have quite as much pocket-money. Some poor man's child may actually grieve him by showing more spending-money than he can come at. Yet he is rich, and the other is poor. The heir without a penny in his pocket is rich in hope. The salvation of believers is prospective. They are "heirs of salvation," "heirs of promise," "fellow-heirs," and "heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Though they cannot show much money, they have title-deeds and proofs of pedigree, and a cast of countenance bespeaking lofty lineage and exalted prospects. Let the orbs of heaven speed their march through a few more revolutions, and dance out a few more circles, and then will come the possession of the wealthy land! Their salvation has begun, is going on, and in its season will be full. In fact and fulness they

are not saved. In the way of hope they are saved. We prefer this second explanation of the clause, "we are saved in the manner of hope," to the first explanation, "we are saved by the means of hope."

The remaining part of this verse is definitive of the nature of hope, "but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" What is present and possessed cannot be an object of hope. Hope exists only till the realisation of its object, and dies a natural death as soon as it reaches home. The moment it touches the threshold it expires. Sight, fruition, possession, equal terms, are the goal and the period of hope. We can only hope for a thing till we acquire it. The expectation goes off in vapour on the acquisition. The object of gospel hope is a good future and invisible, cognised at present by a powerful faith. "While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."—2 Cor. iv. 18. "For we walk by faith, not by sight.—2 Cor. v. 7. We do not yet wear our crowns of glory. At present we have a substitute for them which better befits our militant state, "and for an helmet the hope of salvation."—1 Thess. v. 8. The helmet here, the crown hereafter!

Patience is a fruit of hope, verse 25; "But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." This means that patience comes from hope. In an earlier chapter of this same epistle there is found a different pedigree of patience, as if hope came from patience, instead of patience coming from hope as it is said here. Rom. v. 3-5 reads, "And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." In this scale patience comes *before* hope, whereas in our text the same writer, and in the same letter puts it *after* hope, and makes hope the parent of patience. His consistency is preserved well enough by looking one verse higher up than the point at which our quotation began, where a pre-existing hope comes into view; "and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Thus we find hope to be at a high part of the ladder, and coming in again at a downward point. Troubles do not breed hope, and patience, and experience, except by the action of a hope pre-existing. Patience and experience add to the strength of hope as being its collaterals and fruits. But it is more philosophical to derive patience from hope, which both originates and sustains it. But for hope, where would be our strength to suffer and labour? The vessel would toss and drift into a devious course but for her good anchor, dropped into sound holding ground. So

the mind would veer and shift about, and be unsteady in the pressure of circumstances if there was not a "hope," "sure and steadfast," to keep it to the right point. The vessel rides safe by the help of her anchor. The tempest-tossed saint is indebted to his hope, and is "patient in tribulation." The traveller is patient in the midst of bad roads and the emergencies incident to wayfaring, because he has a hope either of better travelling-ground farther on, or failing that, of a good night's rest and kind entertainment at sun-set. His patience would break if it were not for the pleasant whispers of hope. If we want patience to labour or patience to suffer, let us see to it that we have hope for our patience to lean on, for this patience is a weak dependant virtue that can only get on its journey in the company of other stalwart virtues, and by their aid. Give me a good, clear hope of heaven; it shall not be a trifle that will move me to impatience and fretfulness. But if I lose hope, and expectation be cut off, it is no wonder if I become irritable and uneasy when I have lost my stay. The child may be allowed to cry when it has lost its mother or its nurse. And is not hope the nurse of patience? "But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." "Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and *patience of hope* in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father." 1 Thess. i. 3. There are various breeds of patience, some of them base and bastardly, and therefore to be avoided. There is a patience of pride, a hard stoical patience that is defiant and ungodly, fit only for an atheist. There is a patience of indifference, born of stupidity such as an ass has. There is a patience of love, a high-born holy thing that will endure any amount of suffering to please God. And there is a patience of hope, not equal in moral excellence to that of love, but nearly akin to it, and powerful to sustain and elevate the mind. Reader, take counsel. If you wish to get well through the hardships and casualties of this wayfaring life attend to your hope of heaven, and see that it be well-founded and clear. So shall you lighten the burden of life, or which is equal, gain strength additional to bear it; and if the back be stronger the burden sits lighter in that proportion. If you wish to excel in patience there is a philosophical necessity for you to keep an eye to your hope, since there is an established connection between the two. To thrive and prosper, patience must keep company with its powerful helper —love. Something better follows in

Verse xxvi. "Likewise the spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered."

The Spirit *also* helpeth our infirmities. We are not left to the bare influence of hope. The help of hope is good. But we have

besides, the help of the Spirit—a personal agent. Hope has no personality except in rhetoric, though it has a real motive power, and stands our friend on many occasions. But we have a still better friend, the Spirit *also*, without whose grace even hope could not sustain us.

The term "*likewise*" requires a word of explanation. In this verse it is necessary to deprive it of its ordinary force. Its usual meaning is, "*in the same way or manner.*" To say that the Spirit helps us in the same style in which hope helps us would not be a true statement, but contrary to fact. Hope helps us by reference to something future. The Spirit helps us with grace bestowed on the occasion. He aids us with an influence quite distinct from motive power. We must therefore make free to cancel the force of the term likewise, a liberty which exegesis obliges us to take on other occasions as well. Instance the passage, Luke xiii. 1-5., in which the word occurs twice, once concerning the persons slaughtered over their sacrifices, and once concerning the eighteen unfortunates crushed to death by the falling tower of Siloam. Jesus said to those for whose admonition he cited the facts, "Except ye repent ye shall all *likewise* perish." He could not mean that they would all perish *in that way;* for he had named two different modes, and if they all perished in the one way they could not all perish in the other way. He meant simply that they would perish. Take the same liberty of explanation here. "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities," means that hope having helped us, the Spirit does likewise—helps us, the help being quite as substantial, the mode of it differing.

Likewise the *Spirit* helpeth. What spirit? Not as some say, the spirit of adoption, or our own spirit, but, we think, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the third person in the trinity. The new dispositions begotten in us at our regeneration are helpful, no doubt. The filial feeling emboldens us. It makes us strong when we feel we have an able father to take interest in us. An orphan who knows his orphan state and feels his position, cannot be expected to have the same strong-heartedness as the boy has whose father is still living. This filial spirit is certainly a help to believers. But it is too weak as an explanation of our text. Neither do we accept the explanation that our own spirit helps us. Help is properly a foreign element, outside of us, and additional to our self-resources, and if we had only our own spirit to help us, there would turn up occasions when we would be very ill-helped indeed. The proverb that speaks of self-sustaining courage acknowledges its inadequacy to meet all occasions, "The spirit of a man will sustain his infirmity; but a wounded spirit who can bear?" Prov. xviii. 14. Under bodily infirmity a brave spirit bears up. Let the infirmity touch the mind itself and make it droop, then the proud helper stoops and

wants help for itself. A man cannot in such case come to his own succour, for that in him that should come to the rescue is crippled and weak. We are shut up to accept the best and highest explanation of the passage, understanding by the spirit, the Divine Spirit. As there is so much said in this chapter about the Holy Spirit being the believer's friend, and guide, and help, and advocate, and witness, and compassion, we need not hesitate to set our explanation up to this high level. Nay we should rejoice rather to have it so. Whilst we tremble at our lofty privilege let us not fail to enjoy it, and in time of need expect the help of the Almighty Spirit.

The Spirit helpeth *our infirmities*—our moral infirmities or our intellectual infirmities, or both. Our physical infirmities may be laid out of the question here, though it is from them that we have the idea of infirmity. And though this text means the other infirmities, the Spirit will not be indifferent about our bodily weakness, or lose sight of our vulgar wants and common sufferings. "He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust." And when our minds stoop under the pressure of pain or affliction, he will be near to help; to strengthen our courage, to enliven our hope, and quicken our drooping graces, is the Spirit's office. He helps us, or helps *with us*. Such is the force of the original word, which means to assist jointly or along with. It means as much as that when we are stooping under a heavy burden, a person comes up opportunely and puts to his hand and lifts along with us, not freeing us from the load, but materially lightening it by easing the weight off our shoulders. For such assistance we are thankful. Though the person is behind us and we cannot see him, we are sure, by what we feel, that he is there, and we speak out our thanks for the timely interposition. This divine helper, instead of helping us to bear the burden, could he not free us of it entirely, which would be much more pleasant to us than merely qualifying it? What hinders this? The law of probation renders it more proper that we should be helped in a measure, than that we should be excused from bearing it all. It is ungenerous of us to think of such a thing! We would go easily to heaven. We would have rest here and rest there. We would desire to be in heaven all the time we are on the way to heaven. Let us be reasonable now. Through the wilderness is the way to Canaan. Our Father knows best what road to lead us, and what moral drill and discipline to put us under. It becomes us to say—

> "I'll bear the toil, endure the pain,
> Supported by thy word."

The Spirit's help is realised especially in respect to prayer, "For we know not what we should pray for as we ought." We need to be directed in the *matter* of prayer, "for we know not *what* we

should pray for." We need help in relation to the *manner* or *spirit* of prayer, "For we know not what we should pray for *as we ought.*" Our ignorance and deficiency are supplemented by the Spirit. He becomes our teacher. If we do not know what we need, he does. If we are deficient in the spirit of prayer, he can breathe on our hearts and kindle up desire and sentiment. The Spirit teaches us to say our prayers effectually. He instructs us in holy oratory, and gives us skill and persuasive power. This is our encouragement. Human philosophy frowns on prayer as irrational and useless, as an act of presumption, as the dictation of a worm to omnipotence. Philosophers have taught that men should let prayer alone, because they do not know how to address so great a being nor what to make the subject of petition. Philosophy has said well, and named a sufficient hindrance to prayer. But revelation obviates the difficulty, and rolls away the stone of hindrance. We do not know what to pray for, but the Spirit knows and he guides our lips and hearts. Left to ourselves, we might as well slip the duty as perform it. We would be asking unwarrantably, and to our own damage. Some of us that are poor and dependent, and in obscure positions, would be asking to be made rich and distinguished, and to be situated where we could figure and be conspicuous. We would pray ourselves into popular preachers and successful merchants, and talented men and men of mark and genius. And our prayers, if answered, would very probably be our ruin. Now, prayer being in the Spirit's power or authority, we are kept clear of such deadly error. It is the Spirit's province to dictate our prayer. Except on his dictation no prayer is genuine.

"But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." Intercession is an interference of some one between two parties. The agent in this work speaks to one of the two about the other, it may be, seeking favour for the person spoken of, but not necessarily so. Intercession is sometimes adverse in its purpose, of which we have an example in this same epistle, chap. xi. ver. 2: "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel." We cannot well trust a mere man between us and God, for that man's forbearance or love may not be answerable to our necessity, and he might damage us if his prayer and limited notions were to be acted on. It appears Elijah would have stirred up God's anger against Israel if he could. We know that Jonah interceded against Nineveh, and remonstrated with God for being so pitiful towards its inhabitants. Jonah iv. 1-3. Jeremiah too, the weeping prophet, the man renowned for tender sensibilities, could pray very harshly concerning his enemies: "Therefore forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight, but let them be overthrown before

thee, deal thus with them in the time of thine anger." Jer. xviii. 23. We have intercessors more kindly and reliable. The saints have two illustrious advocates, aye, divine advocates, namely, Christ and the Holy Spirit, between whose respective intercessions there is a marked difference. Christ, who made intercession for the transgressors on earth, now makes intercession in heaven for saints. "Who also maketh intercession for us." This he does in heaven in a direct manner, his voice, or the voice of his precious blood, going directly to the Father's ear. The mediatorial intercession is made in heaven to the Father in heaven, by the direct agency of the great High Priest. It is not so with the Spirit's intercessions. These reach the mercy-seat indirectly and circuitously from the hearts and lips of believers on earth. The Spirit originates and prompts the earnest prayers of believers, and is said to intercede for them on that account. True prayer is a reflection from the hearts of believers, but the original beam is from the Spirit. They repeat after the Spirit and echo what he prompts; so that the prayer comes down from heaven and goes back to heaven like water that reaches its level. Further, the Spirit's intercessions are often inarticulate. They are groanings. A word is one thing and a groan is another. The groan lacks shape and distinct utterance. The word is from the mouth, the organs of speech being brought together to shape it. The groan is from the breast, and takes no form. Groanings which cannot be uttered are prayers too earnest for expression; deep emphatic prayers, done off within the heart. The groanings are ours, but the Spirit provokes them, and so our prayers bear on them a divine impress. This groaning which is attributed to the Spirit throws our attention back to the groaning of every creature named in the verses above. Creation groans in sympathy with a militant church that travails towards the birth of a heavenly economy. Heaven is not behind in sympathy. An interceding Christ and a pleading Spirit take a deeper interest in the result than all besides. The Spirit fills the mouths of believers with prayer, and sometimes more than fills their mouths, surcharges their heart with inexpressible desire, so that they are struck into adoring silence and can only weep and moan out their meaning. But these groans suffice. The want of expression is no loss, for the reason given in

Verse xxvii. "And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God."

"He that searcheth the hearts" is a circumlocutive formula for God. The sacred penmen often use these round-about expressions instead of the divine name, as e.g. "him that justifieth the ungodly," "him that raised our Lord from the dead," "him that is of power to stablish you," "he that spared not his own Son." In

all such circumlocutions something is expressed suitable to the matter on hand, as in this instance, "he that searcheth the hearts," meets the requirement in demand. Being able to read the heart he can interpret the groan. We may glide off into a lesson of admonition at this point. The searcher of hearts is one of whom we should stand in awe. His prerogative it is, to keep the keys of our breasts, and to be in all our secrets, and apprised of all our desires and purposes. We cannot bar out his piercing eye. The heart is a crypt that we can lock up from all others, but not from him! "If we have forgotten the name of our God, or stretched out our hands to a strange god, shall not God search this out? for he knoweth the secrets of the heart."—Psalm xliv. 20, 21. Our overt actions are all done in his sight; our covert purposes and designs which we never breathe to our most familiar friends cannot escape his cognisance. He knows the evil which we do, that we ought not to do; he knows the good which we ought to do because we have power and fair occasion for it, but which we fail in, and he will charge it to us. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin."—James iv. 17. "If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, behold, we knew it not, doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul doth not he know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his works?"—Prov. xxiv. 11, 12. This by-lesson we steal in, as being wholesome and necessary, for we must have something besides the sweet milk of consolation or we shall be over-run with unhealthy humours. The proper application is for comfort, assuring us that our deep-felt, ill-expressed, or even unexpressed prayers are perfectly understood by the Lord. Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him. Any informality in the wording of your petitions creates no difficulty. He can transpose your awkward sentences, throw off what is needless and add what is lacking. If you say nothing at all he understands you. Let your prayer be composed of sobs, and sighs, and groans, it comes before him as clearly as if expressed in the most select terms. "Lord, all my desire is before thee, and my groaning is not hid from thee."—Psalm xxxviii. 9. And yet, this is not the very bottom of what the passage means. It is true enough he knows what your meaning is, and what is your mind. But the place expresses more than this, "He knoweth what is the mind of the *Spirit*." He understands the hand writing of his own secretary who indites and prepares your prayers and provokes you to say them or groan them, or to feel and intend them when your heart is too full for utterance. The mind of his own Spirit is known to him. True prayer is of divine generation, and the Father who hears prayer understands the Spirit that genders it.

"Because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." The Lord understands and approves the prayers of his people indited by the Spirit, because they are harmonious with himself, "according to God," not cross or contrary to his nature or honour, but every way worthy of him to concur in, and honour with an answer. Such prayers are always answered. It is impossible for them to fail, unless we could suppose God and his Spirit to be of two minds, or that he should be at variance with himself, which would be a reflection upon his unity and integrity. If intercessions are according to God, he will accord them, endorse them, and answer them, time and circumstance being referred to him of course. "And this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us: and if we know that he hears us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him."—1 John v. 14, 15. Prayers that are never answered are left in that neglect evidently because they are not according to God. They come athwart his will, or laws, or purpose, or are contrary to his glory and the creature's good. Can it be wondered at that prayers which are wrong in the matter of them, or in the motive, end, or aim, should meet with failure? We must not hastily conclude against our unanswered prayers that they are of the failing kind. The prayers that have not been honoured with an answer may be lying over to some future time. The answer of them will come yet if they were of divine dictation; if not, it is of no consequence. We ought not to dignify by the name of prayer all our public exercises, nor perhaps all our private exercises. We may have prayed, if not for the wrong thing, yet for the right thing with a false aim; some base motive may have been at the root of our prayer, like a vile worm withering it into failure. We may have prayed sometimes just for the sake of praying, and to fill up our customary amount of self-appointed exercises. We had better do less and do it better.

It is of paramount importance that we should have a firm belief in the personality of the Holy Spirit, and that we should seek unbroken communion with him, and be obedient to his motions within us, and put away every thing that would grieve him. Let us say to the Spirit, what one of the disciples said to Jesus, "Lord, teach us to pray." We can no more have success in prayer without the Spirit than we can without the good offices of the Mediator. The blood of Christ and the breath of the Spirit are both essential elements of acceptable devotion. "For through him we both have access by one *Spirit* to the Father."—Eph. ii. 18. May the Spirit of grace and of supplication fill and actuate us evermore. Amen.

T. G.

ART. III.—ON MINISTERIAL ABILITY.*

WHEN the Lord Jesus Christ entered upon his great work he received by Jordan's stream, and at the hands of the Eternal Father, a truly divine consecration. The heavens were opened, the Spirit of God descended upon him, and a voice said, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." When Paul and Barnabas were appointed to their apostolic mission to Asia Minor and Gentile Europe, the church at Antioch publicly set them apart, and with prayer and faith sent them forth to preach the Gospel of Christ. In accordance with those ancient examples, in the presence of this assembly, and at the hands of the church, you also, dear brethren, are publicly and solemnly dedicated to the ministry of the Gospel in connection with the Primitive Methodist Church.

Only a few years have gone since, with deep convictions of duty, you left your homes and business to go forth into the highways and bye-ways of this land in order to proclaim to dying man the unsearchable riches of Christ Jesus, and to afford an additional illustration of the words of the prophet: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings; that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good; that publisheth salvation."

During those years you have had successes and reverses, joys and sorrows, trials and triumphs. The burden of souls weighing heavily upon the heart, the chilling apathy of the church, the fiery cross of persecution, the mighty battle with spiritual wickedness in high places, and the protracted spiritual struggle—a struggle in which the human heart seemed as adamant, and the heavens as brass, you have doubtless experienced again and again. But you have seen again and again the quivering lip, and the contrite tear, and you have heard the sobbing of the penitent heart, the cry of "God be merciful to me a sinner," the exulting shout of salvation, the rapturous song upborne by faith and hope to heaven, and the final burst of "Victory, victory, through the blood of the Lamb." Your work, dear brethren, in warning the world of sin, in leading lost men to the arms of an infinitely loving Saviour, in guiding and cheering the pilgrims of Christ in their wilderness journey, and in consoling their departing spirits, is the grandest in the universe of God. As is the huge Alpine mountain to the puny

* A charge delivered at the ordination of the Revs. J. S. Boyes, H. S. Matthews, W. Codville, R. Auger, and R. Hazzard, at the Primitive Methodist Conference, of Canada, in the Brock Street Church, city of Kingston, Canada West, June 14th, 1865.

molehill, as is the magnificent noonday sun to the feeble glow-worm, so is this ministry of the Gospel to every other employment in earth or heaven.

The probation which you, my dear brethren, have now completed, has been subject to constant observation. The wakeful eye of the world has been upon it, marking your every step, and noting your every word. The Eternal Jehovah in his vast omniscience has seen it, and recorded your thoughts and feelings, your words and actions in his Book of Remembrance. The church with which you are associated has watched it, weighing your private and public labours, and seeking to thoroughly know your piety and principles, your energies and attainments. Every upward step in your mental and moral career has been carefully observed; each aggressive effort for Christ, and each corresponding triumph in the enlargement of Zion, in the salvation of souls, has been seen and rejoiced over, while in sorrow the church has bowed to weep when indolence with its benumbing power, spiritual declension with its blasting chill, or adversity with its painful burden, has hindered you in your work of mercy. But, brethren, by the grace of God you have come up unscathed and unbroken from amongst these temptations and trials. Most acceptably you and your work have stood the inspection of Conference; so that the last test having been applied, the final examination closed, and convinced that you have gifts and graces for the great work to which you profess to be called, your fathers and brethren have in conference assembly decided, and on the books of the church recorded, that you be now received into the annual list, into full Connexion as ministers of the Primitive Methodist Church.

As the public seal of this final decision, as the expression of the great change taking place in your ministerial relationship, as the renewed consecration of your souls and bodies to the work of Christ, and as the enunciation before man and heaven of the estimation in which you are held by the church, of her confidence in your integrity, ability, and piety, and of her expectations as to the worth, power, and success of your future labours, you are now ordained to the ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ; an ordination witnessed by your fathers and brethren, and by those assembled people of God; an ordination in the presence of that greater cloud of witnesses who have come up out of great tribulation and washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, and an ordination in the presence of the Eternal Godhead; the Father bending from his throne of ineffable grandeur approacheth to bless you; the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, decends to bless you. For, brethren, ye are not your own, but set apart henceforward and for ever to Christ and his work in the world's salvation. Therefore, as bought with a price, as ordained to the ministry of

the Gospel, as consecrated to Christ Jesus, glorify God to the uttermost with your souls and bodies, which are his.

Allow me, dear brethen, to remind you on this solemn occasion that, though your probation may be ended, your real ministerial life is but beginning; that though the trials and tests of that peculiar period may be closed, yet the great task and supreme work heaven hath put into your hands are but commencing. The probation you have just completed has been but the preface and preparation for future labour. With suffering and toil you have laid a foundation on which you have to build a glorious superstructure, the topstone of which shall be put on amid shoutings of joy in the palace of God. By divine grace you have become as streams of life to earth, and like the St. Lawrence, rolling past us in silent majesty, those streams must deepen and widen until multitudes of souls are borne on their bosom into the ocean of God's presence. The Redeemer has set you in the midst of the world as luminaries, and like the glorious orb of day, you must rise higher and shine brighter, effusing the world with the light of truth and love. Thus your work is not behind, but before. The past is the spiritual apprenticeship, while the future is the crowning life of labour and battle, of victory and glory.

That there are those who make probation the race, and ordination the prize, with sorrow, we confess. The former is the season of work in order to win, while the latter is accepted as ensuring maintenance, position, and ease. Preaching is practised as a mere profession, a fashionable trade and innocent pastime, rather than the awful and urgent necessity which pressed upon the Apostle when he exclaimed, "Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel."—1 Cor. ix. 16. There are others who give rich promise of ability and usefulness during probation, but on reaching the Annual List somehow settle down to quietness and ease; their books are closed, their study is forsaken, thought flung to the winds, the same old sermons are retailed through the land, all aspiration after a godlike ministry is despised, zeal for souls abandoned, power with God in the closet counted as nought, and, sitting down, they, as it were, fold their arms, compose their limbs, close their eyes, sing, and dream their poor blank lives away. They are ministerial sluggards, a disgrace to their functions and a pest to the church. But we hope better things of you. The Church expects nobler and grander lives than those of the professional and slipshod sluggard. Having learnt to work in the field of God, we pray that you may keep your hand steadily on and firmly grasp the Gospel-plough to the end of your days. Having been trained to wield the sword of the Spirit, we depend upon your going forth into the thick and heat of the fight, and with strokes of might laying low the armies of satan. Brethren,

man and God expect that, instead of idlers and ease-takers you will manfully fight and work for Jesus; boldly but tenderly tell the people words whereby they may be saved; endure hardness as good soldiers; be strong, studying to show yourselves approved—workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth.

The attainment of eminent usefulness, to reach the full height of sanctified influence, and to bring the highest possible glory to the Saviour, should be the supreme aim and the ruling passion of every minister. But, brethren, the realization of this great end demands that you accept of Christ Jesus as your exemplar and pattern. He stands before you in majesty as the great teacher and the true minister. Bending from his mediatorial throne in the heavens of glory, he says to his ministering servants; "If ye would be my disciples, the preachers of my truth, you must tread in my steps, copy my example, and follow my words." To follow the saintly Howe, the indomitable Baxter, the seraphic Fletcher, the devoted Wesley, and the zealous and sanctified Clowes must be only so far as they followed Jesus. Nay, to follow the loving John, the eloquent Apollos, the ardent Peter, or the greatest of all, Paul, the Gentile apostle, must be no further than they followed Christ Jesus. To go beyond Christ is impossible, while less than Christ must not be thought of as the pattern of the Christian minister.

The lesson of experience, of conscience, and of the Bible is that, *just in proportion as the Divine pattern is abandoned for ministerial fashions, conventional forms, and ritual observances, so in proportion is weakness engendered and failure ensured.* Remember then, dear brethren, let it be written on your foreheads and engraven on your hearts, "*That the success of your ministry is in your likeness and nearness to Christ Jesus the Lord.*" That it is right to gather help from every quarter in your ministrations, to make the material and immaterial things of creation, with their wondrous forms and relationships of use, in illustration and argument in the pulpit, and to gather every fragment of truth that bespangles the universe, as the stars the firmament, and to place them as the silver-setting to your apples of gospel-gold, we allow. But as preachers of redemption, Christ alone in his infinite fulness must fill your hearts, shape your lives, inflame your zeal, fire your intellects, and with words of melting power inspire your tongues. With the apostle of old the minister should, "Know nothing among men but Christ Jesus, and him crucified;" should "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ," and "Grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ."—1 Cor. ii. 2; 2 Peter, iii. 18; Eph. iv. 18.

The great duty thus enjoined in those Holy Scriptures which

you have this day professed to be the rule of your faith, and which you have solemnly pledged yourselves to learn, obey, and teach with all diligence and prayers, is that of growth in all that is Christ-like. Growth is the universal condition of perfection. Nature and grace bow alike to this universal law. The summer rose, beauteous in its budding glory, would never burst in fragrant bloom if it ceased to grow; the grain that clothes our fields in waving green would never gleam with golden beauty and rustle with promised blessing in harvest sunshine without growth; neither can you, my brethren, be valiant soldiers of the Gospel, good workmen in the vineyard of God, successful apostles in winning souls to Christ, and at last when time has ceased and earth gone, glorified saints casting your sheaves at the feet of the Redeemer, unless you constantly and vigorously "grow up into him in all things."

On account of the vast responsibilities and momentous duties that devolve upon you, and the many temptations to lead you from the supreme paths of good, it is needful that you keep in constant spiritual growth. This, brethren, is your safeguard and your hope, and by this you will stand or fall as ministers of the Gospel. On the domestic hearth, on the door of your study, on the desk of your pulpit, on your hours of travel and seasons of prayer, on your hearts, on your lips and on your lives let the grand eternal law be written, as with a pen of iron, "To grow up into him in all things."

The FIRST and the prime element in this growth is heart religion; a constant deepening nearness to God, a purity ever approximating to the infinite purity of the Saviour.

As the Great Head, the supreme model, Christ stands upon the universe arrayed in robes of immaculate holiness. Matchless grace and unsullied spotlessness became him. He was holy, a lamb without spot and blemish; so holy and pure was he that to be a teacher of his school, a shepherd of his fold, an apostle of his Gospel, holiness of the highest kind must be enjoyed in the heart. Practical piety, the soul clinging to the cross as its life and hope; perfect love, the soul bathing in the ocean of infinite perfection, or basking on the mountains of eternal sunshine; this is needed to be able ministers of the New Testament. Heart-felt religion is as indispensable to the fulfilment of your work, dear brethren, as is the presence of the sun to the life and growth of earth. With but little of mental culture and polished speech, without worldly means and finished manners you may be remarkably successful in the salvation of sinners, but never without personal piety. To be ministers of a church, clergymen of a parish, preachers of a circuit, or the agents of a sect or society, without a spark of grace, is not only possible, but alas, too common. But to be true ministers of

Christ without the pardon of sin, without the witness of the Spirit, without Christ in the heart, is utterly and eternally impossible. The attempt is scandalous, heaven abhors it, conscience denounces it, while earth itself condemns the hollow mockery. It is a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal; ruinous and damning to preachers and people.

The ministry which you have undertaken, my brethren, is not of profession merely, but of practice; not a thing of form only, but of reality, not of dead mechanism, but of fervid life. The true apostolical succession is not outer, but inner, of the heart rather than the head, the breath of the Divine, the touch of God rather than the impress of human hand, consisting in vital godliness rather than in clerical garbs and ecclesiastical titles. The latter of themselves are perfect weakness, while the former, like Samson's locks, gives the most stupendous strength. Personal piety, like the sunshine from heaven, gives warmth, light, and power to spiritual ministrations, and though like magnetic attraction, intangible, it yet forms a grand living force with which to draw the world to Christ. Piety places the minister of God on a platform of vast influence, puts into his hands a leverage of great moral power, and gifts him with a might for good that the world cannot stand against. In the temple of ministerial labour, which lifts its head high on earth, eloquence may stand with flushed cheek and uplifted look, amid the world's plaudits; intellect may sit on the throne of authority and bend the universe to its footstool; but far above them both, within the very shadows of the Eternal standeth in meek magnificence the lovely form of religion. With one hand on the throne of God, and the other on ruined humanity, she openeth her lips, when lo, the sick are healed, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the blind see, and the dead are raised up, to praise and magnify the name of the Lord. What the oratory of a Cicero, the erudition of a Bacon, the intellect of a Newton, the imagination of a Milton could not do, the holy, sanctified minister of Christ can accomplish. Under powerful preaching—preaching from a heart on fire with the Holy Ghost, in words and thoughts inspired of mighty prayer and mightier faith, and with arguments and appeals carried home to the conscience by the Spirit of God, the valley of dry bones can be made to move with life, bone to come to bone, sinew to sinew, and a living army raised to sing for ever, "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, unto him be glory and dominion, for ever. Amen."

Seeing then, dear brethren, that the grand secret of success in the ministry of the Gospel is in sanctification of heart, in personal grace, in growing up into him in all that infinite spotlessness which lit up the life of Christ and set him on the throne of the heavens

as the Sun of Righteousness—the bright and morning star, seek as the first and richest gift to have perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord. Whatever your plans for the future, and whatever the prospects of glowing hope you may have created, see to it, that you take not a step in your pathway without being filled with the Holy Ghost. Better, infinitely better, to tarry, amid tears and prayers in Jerusalem until endued with power from on high, than to risk with a cold and useless ministry, the favour of God, the souls of your people, the curse of Nadab, and your own everlasting perdition. As fervent piety and burning zeal can alone give unction and power to your prayers, preaching, and teachings, have first, and uppermost, the baptism of the spirit of God. As your own spiritual state originates and regulates the converting gift, live always with the very heaven of love within you, then a stream of light and life shall issue from you for the salvation of hundreds and thousands. This was the grand secret power of a Wesley, a Bramwell, a Smith, and especially so of our great and holy Clowes; and, brethren, by the help of God let it be yours for ever and for ever; then as good workmen, with the approval of a good conscience, with the blessings of those who were ready to perish, and the smiles of God, you shall be able to exclaim in the dying hour, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

The SECOND element of this growth is knowledge; a mental culture ever expanding towards the infinite fulness of knowledge in Christ Jesus.

There is no standard of intellectual greatness so perfect as the Lord Jesus. He occupies the loftiest summits of thought; with him is infinite ken; his eye ranges over and his mind commands the order and process of the universe; still unequalled in earth and heaven for the infinite proportions, the wondrous activity and matchless intelligence of his mental being, he is yet so humble and so human that the feeblest child of earth feels kinship with him and may accept him as their truest pattern of mental manhood. Wesley, Watson, Chalmers, Butler, Calvin, Origen, Paul and Moses sink into insignificance by the side of this Great Teacher. Those are the lesser lights, while this is the greater light sent down from heaven to enlighten the world. Thus as of infinite majesty, Christ alone becomes our highest and purest model. "Up into him" in mental growth as well as in spiritual grandeur is the great lesson set us by our Master, who hath gone before us into heaven.

Vital religion and mental culture are the great necessities of the Christian ministry, though not in the same degree. They may not be twin sisters, equally beautiful and illustrious, but they are

nevertheless intimately related, and this relationship must be recognised and its obligations discharged in order to secure an efficient ministry. The one is the light of heaven, without which all is spiritual gloom; the other is the candlestick, giving prominence and power to the heavenly flame. The former is an effulgence of glory from the skies of God, the latter, like the atmosphere, is the vehicle for its diffusion. Without some measure of mental life, spiritual life can have no place, while only in the higher forms of the latter can the former attain to perfection. Piety does not eschew intellect, set aside knowledge, or reject study; on the contrary it makes them conducive to its development and finds in them a means of multiplying and spreading its blessing.

There are those who scorn mental gifts, who count knowledge as of no account, and think it a sin to study. We are told by them that when they preach, words and thoughts are given as needed; just as if heaven gave a premium for mental stolidity, and preferred the blunted iron to the polished blade. That owing to the sad tendency of depraved intellect to exalt itself in pride, the Lord has again and again used the weak and the foolish to confound the wisdom and learning of men, to reprove and correct the wicked pretentions of the proud, we admit, but never to the exclusion of sanctified intellect. He who hath bestowed upon man an intelligent nature of unlimited capacity, and provided the magnificent truths of the Bible, and of the natural universe for the use and delectation of that nature, can have no pleasure in thoughts as meagre as the leanest kine of Egypt, and as paltry as sparrows on the house-tops.

The temple of universal thought as a boundless sphere of study is open to you. The great utterances of Deity, with his wondrous deeds of power, as well as the words and works of man are there, spread out by the hand of God for you to know and use. Enter, brethren, that divine temple, and with humble spirit and inquiring mind pray, learn, and worship. The kingdom of knowledge, like the kingdom of heaven, is only taken by force; only by indomitable toil, by the force of a life work, can you master the doings of God, and the thoughts of the master thinkers of humanity. The walks of literature must be well trod, the shady groves of history frequently visited, and the ancient halls of philosophy diligently attended. Especially must the towering mountains and glowing landscapes of theology be the scenes of your daily and hourly sojourn. Wherever human foot has trod in search of truth, there follow; whether amid the green fields and fragrant bowers of earth, where truth nestles in the lowly places, or on the wide table-lands and mountain summits, where she hides her head amid the mists that hang like clouds of glory around the form of the

Eternal, the source and centre of all knowledge; to know all that is worth knowing in the universe of God, and to allow nought but the infinite to be the measure of your attainments, is your great work and solemn duty. "Up unto him in all things."

Above all, dear brethren, it is imperative that you should thoroughly know the Bible. It is your Father's letter, written and sealed with the blood of Christ, and you are its messengers; the law of the Eternal Creator, and in your hands is the exposition and application of it to human conscience; the sword of God, and with power you are expected to wield it, to the destruction of wrong. It behoves you, therefore, to first master this book of books, that your work may not only be done, but well done. The highest discipline of intellect, and the richest accumulation of knowledge you can reach, must be made conducive to the elucidation of the wondrous history, the ancient speech, the peculiar interpretation and the solemn message of the Bible. The application of its grand old comforts to your own hearts as your religion, the elaboration of its great truths in logical order as your theology, and the exposition of its infinite scheme of mercy to man as your work, must command your deepest thought. In the loftiest sense, be ministers of the Spirit, and of the word of the Holy Ghost and of power, studious, intelligent, abiding among, yet going before your people in all that pertains to the Bible, to man, and to God. Preserve as your life the warmth, the humility, and the power of grace, yet surround it with all the lustre of cultivated mind. Brethren, be men after the pattern of Christ, and earth and heaven shall rejoice in you.

The THIRD element of this growth is sociality; in social kindness, ever tending up into the infinite friendliness of Christ Jesus.

Christ is a model man, a true and noble friend full of kindness and tenderness, rich in courtesy and overflowing with gentle, social love. The home scenes of Bethany, fragrant with affection, the beloved disciple resting his head in trustful lovingness on the bosom of the Master, the children enclasped in the arms of him who made the universe, with his hand of blessing upon them, all speak of that perfect intercourse in which divine glory, manhood's frankness, and womanhood's tenderness were so interwoven as to make his word, look, and presence of mighty force for good.

These side pictures of inspired Writ are the reverse of that cold, gloomy, sepulchral demeanour with which some have enshrouded him, and in which others, with downcast, darkened look have sought to imitate him. If the portrait given of him in Scripture is to be credited, the open hand, the beaming countenance, the frank look, the loving smile, the kindly cheer, and the tender word of a true man were characteristic of Christ, and draw us to him as to a brother.

He reproved sin, rebuked error, unmasked hypocrisy, and denounced crowned evil, but it was with matchless grace. Sin was exposed, guilt laid bare, wrong righted, and pride humbled, yet it was with the majesty of tenderness; the rude speech, the eccentric freak, the uncourteous act, the unkind word are not to be found in the Gospel portrait; the pathway of Jesus was lit up with love, gentleness, and truth; the awful attributes and infinite lovingness of godhead combined in him. There was nothing in Christ to repel but his virtue, to displease but his purity, to disgust but his faithfulness. All that could attract and attach humanity to divine things was in him. He was and is still the grand social magnet of the world.

Too long has religion been excluded from the sphere of sociality; too long has earth been led to conceive of piety as cheerless, churlish, and melancholy; too long has the devil been allowed to use the social element as a lever of evil, and too long have we, as ministers, looked on it as of little moment. It is time that each and all of the elements of human being and society were brought into vigorous use for spiritual good, and especially is it time that we, as ministers, by examples as pre-eminent for love and grace as the finite can reach to the infinite of Christ, should uplift the social life of our people into a higher, richer atmosphere.

Under the impress of the grand life of the incarnation, go forth, dear brethren, to your great work as true and noble men; kind, tender, and courteous, yet pure, faithful, and earnest. Every evil, useless habit that may mar your influence, every careless, needless word that may hurt without cause must be put aside. Eccentric ways, social oddities, and peculiar doings that make the world wonder and applaud may do for fools and clowns, but not for you, as the ministers of Christ. Again and again have preachers of the Gospel destroyed their usefulness by these things, but, brethren, flee these social vices. Live above and beyond this low valley of human weakness. Let your path be on the mountains. With courteous ways, loving thoughts, kindly words, and kindlier acts seek to reach as far down into the affections of your people as is within the power of mortal to go, so that in your pulpit labour you may have the highest possible vantage ground, for the pulpit is after all your throne. Be faithful, but at the same time be tender. Reprove sin, but weep over the sinner. Preach Christ as your loftiest theme with energy and power, but be sure and draw your hearers to him with the weight of a loving, godly example. Let your own lives, kind, noble, and holy, be the grandest exposition of your pulpit effort. Grow up into him in sanctified, social worth; into him who is your head, even Christ.

The FOURTH element of this growth is that of pulpit efficiency

an affective ministration ever reaching up to the perfect teaching of Christ Jesus.

Though Christ studied at no earthly school, was untaught in the art of human speech, and deprived of the models of eloquence with which our libraries and galleries are supplied, he yet stands up among men peerless in his greatness as a teacher. We may speak of a Demosthenes who spell-bound the Athenians; of a Cicero who held the Roman senate in trembling awe; of a Chatham who thundered in the halls of St. Stephen, and of a Wilberforce whose silvery voice charmed and softened the Commons of Britain. Still, with all their mighty thoughts and magic oratory, these great men cannot for a moment compare with this, the model teacher of human kind. His path was that of the brilliant orb of day, magnificent and unequalled, while his words were as pure, as direct, and as effective as those penciled rays of light, which coming from the central orb of day flood our world with glory. Wherever he went the common people hung upon his lips, and followed his steps, if so be they might look on his face, hear his voice, and witness his wondrous deeds. And as they departed from his presence they were wont to say to each other, "Truly no man ever spoke like this man." *Christ without seeming effort could so teach the people, as that every word had its weight, and every thought its vital force.*

In your growth up into this effectiveness we would, dear brethren, that you forget not the importance of having clear conceptions of the great truth you bear to your people, clothed in words at once simple and forcible, and with a voice and a manner that not a word may fail or a thought be lost. Defectiveness in one or all of those departments is so much dead loss—labour for nought, while effectiveness is success. Therefore let your thoughts be as clear, as warm, and as life giving as the sunlight, while your rhetoric and elocution, like the atmosphere, must be so pure that not a ray of thought may be distorted, damaged, or lost in its progress to the hearts of your hearers, but each and all, be with power and with the demonstration of the Holy Ghost.

There are those who seem to think that ministerial success depends upon tropes and figures, in rhetorical forms and elocutionary rules rather than in mighty thought and spiritual life. With splendid skill they erect for the admiring public magnificent temples of oratory, and garnish them in rich and wealthy profusion; the pillars are covered with silver, the roof penciled in beautiful forms, the floor laid with richest mosaic, while the altar gleams with dazzling gold. So grand and gorgeous is the edifice that the world, as it gazes, bows in wondering amazement; but, alas, within there is no priest before the altar, no offering made unto

the Lord, no fire to consume the sacrifice, no incense ascending up on high, all is dead, cold and corrupt as the heathen temples of old. In urging you to avoid this rock of a hollow and artificial ministration we do not wish to depreciate the use of figures, nor to eschew the laws of taste; it is your work to make every law and form of human speech, and every tone of human voice subservient to the great work of teaching your people the truth of God in the most effective and powerful manner possible.

By constant study, unceasing toil, and earnest prayer, remove from you, if possible, everything that may in the least hinder or harass you in preaching Christ Jesus. As long as life is given you strive to so improve your thoughts, words, voice, and gesture so that every sentence you utter, whether in the pulpit, on the street, or in the afflicted chamber may be carried to the heart with all the weight of human speech and the charm of human tongue, as well as with the majesty of truth and the power of the divine Spirit from heaven. Like your blessed Saviour, you will then be masters of your work, polished shafts in the hands of God, burning and shining lights in your day and generation, growing up into him in efficiency of labour, who is our head, even Christ Jesus.

The FIFTH and last element of this growth is Divine usefulness; a vigorous approximation to the perfect usefulness of Christ.

The life of Christ was replete with the fulness of blessedness to man. Around it, infinite holiness, eternal truth, Divine kindliness, and matchless ability, for good were encircled as the rolling planets around the orb of day. While as the result, as the stream flowing from this infinite fountain we have usefulness, watering and replenishing the earth, making grass to grow, flowers to bloom, birds to sing, and the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose.

The usefulness of the Lord Jesus Christ was all comprehensive, reaching down to the every day wants of man, and up to the mightiest claims of conscience, and the vastest needs of the soul. With one hand he scattered earthly good and temporal blessing, while with the other he lifted man up from blank despair, lit up his heaven with hope, and led his trembling spirit into the vestibule of glory. When amongst men, he went about, not comforting his flesh, taking his ease, acquiring wealth, or increasing his fame, but with the purity and majesty of godhead, doing good to the bodies and souls of the people. This was his supreme aim, his sole business on earth, and, standing in the fulness of his love amongst the poor and the needy, the fatherless and the widows, the sick and the dying, the fallen and the outcast, he becomes the pattern for his minister, the guiding light for his pilgrim hosts in toil and labour. Hence, brethren, to walk in the steps of your master you must aim supremely at usefulness. Whether in the pulpit or on the platform, in the family or on the street, in the study alone, or

abroad amid the hustling multitude; to fulfil your mission you must be useful. Let nothing deter you from this. Let no cloud darken your vision, no hindrance bar your path, no obstacle stay your progress, and no form attract your attention from this one grand object of your ministry.

This usefulness is contingent on mental, and especially on spiritual advancement. It is the offspring of sanctified, social power and public efficiency. The one is necessary more or less to the other, and they are proportioned to each other. When there is the concentration of every faculty and energy, the whole man drawn up into Christ, there is usefulness; and in proportion as is that growth, so will be the majesty or poverty of the ministry. Therefore, brethren, press up into the fulness, and out into the usefulness of Christ. Your fathers are failing and falling around you, and their mantles of duty and power are descending on you. After long years of toil and hardship, they are resting in bodily weakness from their great work, and heaven hath appointed you to the battle and storm. Go forth then to this great labour, and go in the name and with the weapons of God; be holy, be intelligent, be kindly, be efficient, and depend upon it that so sure as God sitteth on the throne of the heavens, so sure shall usefulness in a rolling tide of blessing be your reward. The Lord shall prosper you by the way; he shall bless you, and that right early; the beauty of the Lord your God shall be upon you; he shall establish the work of your hands upon you, and though now going forth weeping, bearing precious seed, you shall doubtless return again rejoicing, bearing your sheaves with you, while Jesus himself shall welcome you home saying, "Well done thou good and faithful servant, thou has been faithful over a few things; I will make the ruler over many thing; enter thou into the joy of my Lord." So that through the boundless eternity it will still be, "Up into him in all things, who is your head, even Christ."

And now may the God of all mercy keep your hearts and minds in the love of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

J. N.

ART. IV.—GOVERNMENT GRANTS FOR DAY SCHOOLS.

REPLY TO OBJECTIONS.

IN a former article* we attempted to describe the present working and probable results of day schools under government supervision. Some of the positions therein maintained, in favour of grants, have been assailed. Before proceeding with the task of attempting a reply to the principal objections that have been urged, it may be well to place before the reader a few articles from the Revised Code, in order to refresh his memory, and enable him to see the subject in its own light.

As to the Trust Deed of school buildings, for which building grants are received, we have the following: "30. The Trust Deed must declare the premises to be granted in trust for the education of the poor, and for no other purpose whatever. It must also provide for the legal ownership of the premises, and for the inspection and management of the school according to one or other of the precedents settled for: Church of England Schools, British Schools, Established Church of Scotland Schools, Wesleyan Schools, Free Church (Scotland) Schools, Roman Catholic Schools, Jewish Schools, Episcopal Church (Scotland) Schools, Undenominational Schools, (belonging to none of the previous classes, but in which the Bible is read daily from the authorised version.)"

Article 8 decides the question as to what kind of schools may receive the grants: "Every school aided from the grant must be either a school in connection with some recognised religious denomination; or a school in which, besides secular instruction, the Scriptures are read daily from the authorised version." "The object of the grant is to promote the education of children belonging to the classes who support themselves by manual labour. The means consist in aiding (by grants) voluntary local exertion, under certain conditions, to establish or maintain schools, which are either for the instruction of children *(elementary)*, or for training school-masters and school-mistresses *(normal.)*"†

As to inspection, we have the following: "12. No grants are made to schools which are not open to inspection by inspectors appointed by Her Majesty in Council on the representation of the Committee of Council on Education. 13. *The Committee of Council consults the religious or educational bodies which are mentioned in Article* 30 (see above) before making representations

* See "Christian Ambassador," 1866, p. 326. † Art. 4, 5.

to Her Majesty for the appointment of inspectors to visit schools in connection with those several bodies. 14. The inspectors do not interfere with the *religious instruction*, discipline, or management of schools, but are employed to verify the fulfilment of the conditions on which grants are made, to collect information, and to report the results to the Committee of Council." According to article 10 the "aid to maintain schools is given by grants to the managers, conditional upon the attendance and proficiency of the scholars, the qualifications of the teachers, and the state of the schools." Space forbids further quotation.

Against the system to which the foregoing extracts refer, very numerous and startling objections are raised, objections which, if well founded, may well make the friends of the system pause in its advocacy. Some persons meet us with the fundamental objection that government has no right to educate the people at all, but that in attempting it the state goes beyond its proper bounds. Others, who admit the right in question, very hotly resist the regulation requiring the Bible to be read in government schools, affirming that it is an assumption by the state of the right to interfere in matters of religion. Again, there are persons who do not quarrel with this, but think that denominational schools supported by government are inadmissible; that government schools should be of the British School type. Then again we are met by objectors against the system on the ground, that as the system now stands it aids error as well as truth. And to close up all we are told that we cannot, as a religious body, receive grants without the forfeiture of Connexional honour and independence; and that, moreover, we don't need grants, we are doing well without them, and had better therefore act on the common and sensible maxim of letting well alone. Let us proceed to examine these objections, or some of them, and see what measure of solidity and force they possess.

The first objection to be considered is that which is directed against the right of the government to educate. This claims the first attention, for if government really has no right to do what it is doing in this respect, this should settle the question entirely, and render the consideration of other objections unnecessary. Let us hear the objection as it is stated by the most able writer against the grants that we have seen:—"On this subject there are conflicting opinions; but with regard to ourselves as a religious body, we maintain that we are bound to submit to the Word of God; not to Parliamentary blue books, but to the Bible; not to government inspectors' reports, but to the Holy Scriptures. . . . Our religious duties are here distinctly pointed out, and perhaps no duty is more clearly indicated than the duty of parents to teach their children." After citing some texts in which this is undeniably shown, he proceeds:—"Upon parents rests the responsibility of children's

education, and it cannot be abrogated, superseded, nor transferred." And a little further on he remarks: "In opposition to what has now been advanced both philosophers and statesmen from ancient times have asserted the main right of the state to educate the young."*

So far our author. Without going into detail in our reply, we observe that the flaw, the unsound part of the above quotation, is that which places government education in opposition to parental education, and assumes that the one is abrogated, superseded, or transferred by the other, which is no more true than would be the assumption that government authority sets aside parental authority. Whatever might be the case in Sparta, to which the writer refers, it is not so in this country, nor in the United States, nor indeed in any state in Christendom at the present time. Whatever Lycurgus, Plato, or Aristotle taught in this respect, our philosophers and statesmen teach no such thing. The very object of government education amongst us is to assist parents, under certain conditions, in their educational duties, not to wrest such duties out of their hands. Hence the objection is without force, and will be till government shall monopolise all the teaching to itself, which is hardly likely to be.

We have next an attempt to prove from Scripture that kings may not meddle with the work of educating their juvenile subjects; that not only are they disallowed to wrest it from the parents, but they may not touch it at all. Let us hear the proof of this startling proposition:—"It may not be improper to enquire, what saith the Scriptures in reference to the duties of civil government? If it be that divine thing which many have described, its picture and model will, it may be presumed, be enshrined there. We read of the king who was to succeed the theocracy, that when he sat upon the throne of his kingdom he should 'write him a copy of the law and read therein all the days of his life, that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren,' and that 'he that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of the Lord.' We also read that 'rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil.' None of these passages place a sceptre in the monarch's hand to educate the people." . . . "The education of the people of a country cannot but be a very serious matter, and if a government claims to do this, we may surely be allowed to ask whence it derives its authority."†

So far our author. We quite agree with him as to the propriety of submitting this matter to the "law and the testimony," for we also take the Bible to be the ultimate standard of appeal in things civil and social, as well as in things religious. But we cannot accept his conclusion from the three texts produced—that because these passages do not "put a sceptre in the monarch's hand to

* "Christian Ambassador," present year, p. 60. † Ibid, p. 61.

educate the people," therefore government education is unscriptural. This conclusion would not be legitimate unless these passages were allowed to contain all that the Scriptures teach on the subject; for otherwise it is obvious that the duty of monarchs to educate the people may be taught in those parts which are not produced. To reason as this writer has done is the same as if a fisherman were to assert that there are no sharks in the sea, because he had been sailing in some parts and had not seen any; or as if the miner should affirm that there is no gold nor silver in the strata of the earth because he had found none in the places where he had chanced to work. These passages do not therefore prove government education unscriptural. They do not even refer to the subject, and consequently do not warrant any conclusion either way concerning it. But we must now remind the reader that there are other texts which unmistakably point in the direction favourable to our views; as when the church is thus addressed in reference to the time of its ample restoration: "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers (margin nourishers), and queens thy nursing mothers," Isaiah xlix. 23. And again, "Thou shalt suck the breast of kings," lx. 16—words which undoubtedly intimate that kings should, in Christian times, exert a fostering influence upon the church, especially upon its young. So far, then, is the Scripture from being against government education, it is favourable to it. It has in fact, we opine, more Scripture to support it than has even Sunday school tuition. We therefore reassert the right, yea, the duty of government to make suitable provision for the education of the juvenile population. If the state, indeed, denied the right of the parent to educate his child, it would manifestly exceed its bounds, and would deserve the greatest possible opposition and reprobation. But while it is content with merely providing assistance to such parents as need it, and think well to accept it, we think it deserves our approbation rather than our condemnation; and that all who desire the spread of intelligence among the masses should use their influence to induce Parliament to do much more than it yet has done for the culture of the rising population.

But it is insinuated *that government is not competent to the task of educating the people;* and the reason given is the very singular one that "the people are now the teachers of their rulers; opinion works upward from the lower to the higher classes of society; senates and statesmen perform the national will; scarcely ever does it happen that they are in advance of the public mind; from it rather they gather their information and regulate their decisions."* Of course it is not intended to be asserted here that the part of our population who are unable to educate their

* "Christian Ambassador," p. 61.

children are yet for all that better educated than are our members of parliament and ministers of state! We cannot suppose that the writer intends anything so startling as this. If not, the principle he holds forth is the very remarkable one that a government which respects the wishes of the people, and derives instruction from popular expressions of opinion, is thereby proved unfit to educate the people—a principle which no thoughtful person will hold for a moment. In fact, such will hold the contrary opinion—that such a government is the very one that is best fitted for the task in question.

As to what is said about *government education containing a "distinct principle or means of tyranny,"* we simply observe that the remark does not apply in this case, as government does not wrench the children from the control of the parents, and forcibly take them under its own care, but merely offers assistance to such as choose to accept it. Beside, it should be considered that for tyrants to begin their work by expending millions on the task of educating those who are to be their vassals, is certainly, to say the least, a new thing under the sun! Tyranny courts the darkness, not the light; alarm is therefore groundless.

But let us now examine another objection. It has been said that *though it be right and proper for government to aid the work of education, it has no business to insist on the education being of a religious character, as to do so assumes the right on its part to interefere in matters of religion.*

The following brings out the objection:—

"We maintain that it is not the opponents to state aid that bring forward the subject of religion, but it is the government itself, by insisting that religion shall be taught in the schools that receive aid from the public funds." The writer then brings forward the Earl of Derby, who at a Church of England Congress "*emphatically condemned any education without religion,*" which he said was not sanctioned by parliament. Then comes the conclusion: "Now allowing that secular education might be a subject of social arrangement, we maintain that religion never can. If it be admitted that the government have a right to teach religion (and we cannot conceive how government grants can be received without admitting it), then a state church must be right."*

In reply, we observe, the only way in which government insists on religion being taught in schools receiving the grant is simply that the Scriptures shall be read in them daily from the authorised version. This is all the religious teaching government insists on; it does not inspect on religious subjects unless invited to do so, nor does it thrust the Scriptures on any school, but like a well-known gentleman in London, it says, "No school shall be aided

* "Christian Ambassador," p. 63. † Ibid. p. 62, 63.

by my money which does not daily read the Bible." This is not teaching religion, but simply exercising the prerogative of refusing to aid any but such as read the Scriptures, a thing which probably every good man would do in the distribution of his own cash. Hence the reception of grants does *not admit the right of the state to teach religion, but only its right to decline to support any merely secular or infidel education.* Let this be remembered. But suppose it did admit such right, even then the conclusion drawn from it, that therefore a "state church must be right," is utterly unwarranted, unless it were shown that there is no possible way in which government can teach religion but in that of a state church—a principle which discerning, Bible reading men will hesitate before they accept. It comes not within our present purpose to discuss the relations which the state bears, or may bear, to religion; yet it will assist our design to consider that besides Popery, which subordinates the temporal power to the spiritual, there are five different attitudes in which the state may stand towards religion; these are, opposition to it; mere toleration of it; fostering care bestowed upon it; organic connection with it, or state churchism; and finally, intolerance of such as dissent from a state church. The principles involved in these several states of political government, considered as they stand in relation to the Christian church, have all been beheld in vigorous operation; indeed, they are working at present in one place or other. Now, we believe that, in this as in most things, the medium will be found the right way. Opposition to Christianity is heathenish; mere toleration is icy coldness towards it; but, on the other hand, state-churchism is Christianity imprisoned and wearing golden fetters; it is the captive bird that is well fed and occupies a beautiful cage, but is in bondage; while intolerance toward those who dissent from such a church is tyranny of the worst kind. Hence that government which steers between the two extremes, seeking simply to exert a fostering care on religion, is clearly on the right track, and is such an one as the King of kings will acknowledge as his own.

But the objector before quoted proceeds: "It may be said that the Holy Scriptures are the only text book required by government, each denomination of Christians being allowed and expected to add elementary books embodying its own doctrinal belief. But if parliament have a right to teach any portion of religion, it has a right to teach the whole; if it have a right to teach religion in the school, it has a right to teach it in the chapel; if it have a right to teach religion to children, it has a right to teach it to adults, and thus the whole goes in support of the state church system."* To this alarming representation of the matter, the reply given immediately before applies, inasmuch as we have clearly

* "Christian Ambassador," p. 68.

shown, how government may encourage religion without taking it into organic connection with the state, just as a secular business firm may do this without incorporating it with the business. We further observe in reference to the matter, that it does not follow from government having a right to teach religion to children, that, therefore, it has a right to teach it to adults also; unless it be true that nothing is proper to be done to children which is not also proper to be done to adults; and this, we presume, the objector would scarcely venture to assert. Nor from the fact that government has a right to teach religion in the school, does it follow that therefore it has a right to teach it in the chapel also; unless it be shown that nothing may be done in the school which may not be done in the chapel also; or that whoever has a right to teach religion in the school has a right to teach it in the chapel also. Admit the first, and then geography, grammar, and arithmetic may mingle with prayer meetings and sermons in the sanctuary; admit the second, and then every one who teaches in a day school may officiate publicly in the religious services of God's house. If these positions cannot be admitted—and the reader will see that they cannot without involving palpable absurdities—then it cannot be allowed to follow that because government may teach the Scriptures in the school, it may do this in the chapel also. The one does not at all involve the other. We have therefore overthrown both the premiss and the conclusion.

We hope it is clear to the reader, by this time, that by accepting educational grants on the conditions named in the revised code, we do not concede the right of the government to set up a state church. All we admit is simply what Scripture requires, that kings should be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers, to their juvenile subjects; that they should say with king David, "Come ye children, hearken unto me: I will teach you the fear of the Lord;" yea, that they should cry out with Solomon, David's illustrious son, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth." This can be done, this in many places is done, apart from a state church, and in no way involves the principle of such a politico-religious organisation. The United States never had a state church, but the state there provides education for the people. The two things never have been associated there—a proof most clear that they may exist apart; and we venture to hope that the time may come in England, when the government shall have a great deal more than now to do with religious education, and a great deal less with the religious body which, at present, holds its head above all others, in consequence of its organic connection with the state.

But we now hasten to notice the very popular objection, *that though it may be right for government to aid education by grants, these ought not to be given to denominational schools; for if they*

are, we are presented with the spectacle of the various sects of the church receiving aid from the State. These are the views of a gentleman who has written many letters against grants in the *Wesleyan* (now the *Methodist*) *Times:* for in one of his published letters he intimates that on the question of grants to *un*sectarian schools, he and his opponent, after mutual explanations, should not differ much. The same view is held by another writer on the subject who appears in the "Ambassador:" if we understand him, his main objection is against receiving grants for Connexional schools.* The Congregationalists, as a body, hold this view, supporting British Schools in connection with the State, but not denominational ones (though one school, at least, belonging to this body, receives the grant, and the denomination in general seems to be rapidly coming round in its views on the subject.†) In the Primitive Methodist Conference recently held at Luton, the same idea was expressed by some estimable men; they favoured British Schools, but objected to denominational ones. Several Circuits returned the same view to the last District Meetings.

Now, not to dwell on the evasion which is apparent in such a view, to us the opinion in question seems unsound and destitute of force, mistaking the point at issue. We do not deny, indeed, that grants to denominations really aid those denominations; this, however, is not the principle of such grants, but a mere accident; the benefit is not designed, and is only indirect. The main, in fact the only, design of the State in connection with these grants is to assist in educating the people; and finding a number of sects, each having the oversight of vast numbers of children, it simply uses them as ready-made appliances for effecting the excellent object in view. Now it cannot be sound reasoning to object to grants merely because they indirectly aid denominations, unless we are prepared to admit the sweeping assertion, that everything in law which indirectly favours them should also be objected to on the same ground; and then how many good laws would escape? Were Primitive Methodist day-schools, therefore, to accept the grant, it would not be to promote Primitive Methodism, but simply education, notwithstanding Primitive Methodism might derive indirect benefit from the transaction. This formidable difficulty has, therefore, nothing more than a visionary existence.

To many minds another difficulty presents itself: *by accepting government grants we put ourselves on the same level in this respect with Roman Catholics, Unitarians, &c., and, under such circumstances, how can we give our voice against them? Can the grants be right, seeing that it is an undeniable fact that though they assist truth, they also assist error; that*

* "Christian Ambassador," present year, p. 260.

† See postscript to this article.

while they nourish orthodox denominations, they also afford equal nourishment to bodies that are heterodox? Let us hear the writer first quoted: "We have a professedly Protestant government teaching all the conflicting religious sentiments of those who may feel disposed to take its money, and, in fact, teaching the sentiments of a church which is denounced in the homilies of the government church as a 'foul, filthy, old, withered harlot,' in fact, 'as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen.' Will our people join hands in such a confederacy? Will they, for the sake of a little filthy lucre, sacrifice the independent position they have occupied and do occupy?"*

The other writer in the "Ambassador" against government grants, takes the same view. Here are his words: "It (that is, the voting of money for education) may afford an inferential ground of belief that government considers it to be its duty, directly and systematically to educate the people, but is yet obliged, because of the state of political or other parties, to compromise itself, to forego its own proper functions, to abandon what is abstractedly or politically right, and to be content, ignobly and indirectly, to teach Churchism—high, low, and broad, with all their divisions, sub-divisions, and cross-divisions—together with Romanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Mormanism, and even (if it could be so base as to use the Bible for the purpose) Atheism. . . . Is it then for *free* Primitive Methodists to become a party to such an arrangement? Can it then be right or necessary for the Connexion to accept grants, when the morality of such an act can even, upon the most distant ground, be called in question?"†

So far our two objectors. In the late Conference the same objection was raised. It frequently turns up, also, in conversations on the subject, and in discussions at quarterly meetings. In replying thereto we have no wish to evade the difficulty, but frankly to confess, and courageously to meet it. It is freely admitted that educational grants do promote the spread of error as well as of truth—do minister to the extension of Popery as well as Protestantism, of Unitarianism as well as Trinitarianism. The heterodox can obtain grants as readily as the orthodox. All this we admit. But here is the point at issue: on what principle of reasoning does it follow that it is therefore wrong for orthodox denominations to receive such grants? The assistance given to error is only indirect; it is not intentional, it is not designed. The grants are made to Unitarian Schools, not because they are Unitarians—to Papists, not because they are Papists—but because they have children in their schools that require educating. And the advantage such sects receive in consequence of being the media of these grants,

* "Christian Ambassador," p. 63. † Idem, p. 262.

is, we repeat, nothing more than accidental or indirect, and not the result of intention, as, we think, must be manifest to all. This being allowed, it will follow that to reject educational grants, because they indirectly aid error as well as truth, would be to admit the principle *that anything which indirectly advances error as well as truth ought to be rejected.* And this granted, we shall have to reject many other laws besides those relating to such grants; we shall have, in fact, to reject religious liberty and a free press; yea, we shall have to go into the domain of nature and reject the influence of the sunshine and rain, and the fruits of the earth, for it cannot but be clear to every one that all these things indirectly, accidentally, and without design, tend to nourish error as well as truth. This, we repeat, would follow from the admission of the principle laid down; it, therefore, must be unsound, and as we never think of rejecting bread because it nourishes Papists as well as ourselves; as we do not denounce the freedom of the press, or civil and religious liberty, because Papists, no less than ourselves, flourish and grow under their fostering care; where is the fairness of rejecting and denouncing educational grants for this reason? The objection, therefore, falls to the ground.

Primitive Methodists may, then, become "parties to such an arrangement as that connected with grants," without their "morality" being in the least degree tainted; they may "join hands in such a confederacy," without sacrificing, in the least degree, "the independent position which they have occupied and do occupy," just as they eat the same bread as heretics, and become parties to other laws which offer benefits to all alike, irrespective of class, rank, or creed, without any such sacrifice. And after doing this they will be as free as aforetime to denounce prevailing errors; and in addition thereto, will be educationally and numerically stronger to grapple with and overcome them.

Let us here pause and see how far we have travelled on our journey. We have refuted the objection that since Scripture assigns the work of education to parents, government has no right to educate the young; and have shown that government education is not opposed to parental education, any more than government authority is opposed to parental authority; and that as the state assists parents in upholding their authority, it ought to assist them, when necessary, in the work of education, thus fulfilling the Scripture, which describes good kings as nursing fathers to their subjects. The objection that government ought not to make the teaching of religion in the schools a condition of the grant, as such a course assumes its right to set up a state church, has been met by the remark that no such right is assumed, but only the simple right of withholding aid from schools which do not use the Scriptures; but we have further shown that a Christian government ought to exert a

fostering influence upon religion; which can be done, and, in fact, is done, without taking the church into an organised connection with the state. The objection, that even admitting the lawfulness of grants for unsectarian schools, it is not right to receive them for denominational ones, thus promoting sectarian extension by state aid, has been refuted by the remark that the extension of a denomination is not the principle of the thing, but a mere accident of it; and that the objection would not be valid unless it were shown that we ought to reject all laws that indirectly aid religious denominations; to prove which would be a hard task. The very alarming objection that we ought not to accept grants, because they aid the extension of error as well as truth, has been shown to involve the principle that everything which aids error as well as truth ought to be rejected— a principle far more sweeping than the new Reform Bill—and one which no one will try to establish or maintain. Hence the reader will see, that as far as principle and conscience are concerned, the way is clear to receive educational grants. The arguments used in our former article were said to have failed in producing conviction, on account of their "worldly expediency character." Such a remark can hardly be made in reference to the character of the above arguments, which it will be seen all relate to the essential principles of the thing, and not to its expediency at all. We must, however, touch the subject of expediency before we close our observations. And to this department of the subject probably belongs the objection, that *even though it may be right to receive government grants for denominational schools, it would yet be far from honourable to do so—would be, in fact, something like Primitive Methodism doffing its hat and going to the relieving officer for parochial aid—that such a course would convert an independent connexion into the mean condition of a pauperised one.* This view is entertained by many estimable persons, who are jealous for the honour of the Connexion, and would part with a right hand rather than contribute to its degradation. Receiving what is called the "government *dole*" is spoken of as being synonymous with the "sacrifice of independence." Now, let it be distinctly understood that we are as jealous for the Connexion's honour as any other persons can be, but we cannot see how this would be in the least tarnished by our accepting educational grants. To call them a "dole" is, to say the least, a misnomer; a dole is something given as a gratuity, something given in charity. But these grants are not gratuities, but wages paid for very hard brain work, wages paid to the schoolmaster by the State for important service rendered by him to it in the education of its juvenile population, and wages the payment of which for such work will manifestly tend, not to impoverish, but enrich the national purse. The elegant comparison by which the recipients of these grants are likened to

paupers, (we speak thus without disrespect—dependent persons may be honourable), therefore falls to the ground. If it be still urged that there is the element of pauperism in the thing, inasmuch as the parents, not the government, ought to pay for education; we reply by stating the obvious fact that government, as well as the parent, has a very important interest in every child in the realm, and a duty to perform towards it. The monarch is, in fact, another father, so to speak. Why then should not the state, where necessary, bear part of the expense of education along with the parent? Why should not the sharers, both of the responsibility and of the benefit, be also the sharers of the financial burden?

No! government grants are not doles, neither are their recipients paupers. The State money is given in honest wages for hard work—and work, moreover, which must be done, and be proved to be done, too, before the wages can be received. Or to ascend a little, perhaps it would be more in accordance with the principle of the thing, to speak of the grants as government prizes for efficient teaching—for no masters can claim them that are not efficient, and those who claim the most are such as are proved by their work to be the most efficient. Is this, then, the principle of a dole—of pauperism? If so, then we must in future classify the recipient of parochial relief with the bearer of golden prize medals, bestowed on their owners as marks of distinction for high excellence and ability. We conclude from all this that the fear of bartering away Connexional honour for these grants is, therefore, entirely groundless.

But, finally, it is objected that *we can do without government grants, and therefore had better have nothing to do with them; that we are now doing well, and had better not alter, lest we should deteriorate.* And as a proof of this we are informed that the Wesleyans, who receive grants in aid, have not increased numerically so rapidly as we have done who have them not—an observation, however, that scarcely applies, this year, when the Wesleyan increase is greater than our own; yet we admit the fact that, in general, we do outstrip our friends just named in numerical progress. This, however, does not necessarily prove that we have no need of educational grants, though it is a presumption of it; for there may be, and it is generally allowed that there are, important agencies at work amongst us, which are not, to any noticeable extent, employed amongst them—we refer to open air worship, etc. —and these may account for our superior increase, and make up, numerically, for our educational deficiencies. But it is manifest that having such agencies, were we equal to them educationally, our increases would exceed theirs even more than they do at present—a view which is sustained by the fact, that when we were more nearly equal with them in this respect than we are at present; that is, when, before the year 1846, neither they nor we had grants, our

increases were greater as compared with theirs, than they are found to be at the present time. The statistical argument is, therefore, in our favour.

But we are partly missing the point at issue, which is not numerical increase, but the education of young people. The question is, not whether we increase more rapidly than others, but are we making sufficient provision for the instruction of children? And to this let our almost total absence of day schools utter the stern and unmistakable reply! Have we not scores of circuits without a single day school in them? Is it not a significant circumstance, pointing out our sad deficiency in this respect, that day schools form no part at all of our denominational statistics? To plead, under such circumstances, that we have no need of educational grants for day schools, is about the same thing as to say, "Never mind about our children growing up ignorant, so long as we can get sinners converted! never mind about our own families being alienated from the Connexion, so long as we can increase our numbers from among the outlying population!" From a condition so unnatural, let us hope that as a Connexion we shall be saved by the speedy institution of denominational day schools. Let us not do less to save the masses, but more if we possibly can; do, however, let us try to bring up our own children in such a manner as that they may become intelligent and influential members of our own community, which we cannot do while we put them out to other bodies to be educated.

But the objection now under consideration is not only not against government aid, but strongly in its favour. The very rapid numerical increase of the Connexion shows the necessity of our accepting grants, and not the contrary, inasmuch as it is manifest that more children are thereby thrown upon our hands than we are able, without extraneous aid, to educate. Were we as a body slow in growth, like the Friends, we might educate all our own children, and many more besides. But the case is far different. It is somewhat amusing, under such circumstances, to read that "the Connexion's peculiar position in relation to day schools will render it still more obvious that government aid is unnecessary." And here is the singular proof of this: "The Connexion's power of adaptation to the wants of many places, and its general ability to obtain standing and support in the smallest of them, make it impossible for it to establish schools wherever its operations extend." This is peculiar reasoning indeed. It is, in fact, saying that our evangelistic power so greatly exceeds our educational, that therefore we do not need government grants in aid of the latter!—that we are so unable to educate our increasing hosts that we do not need help in the work! Some persons would have drawn the opposite conclusion, and said that, as we are so far behind, educationally, so unequal to our mission in this respect,

we therefore greatly need these grants to bring us up to the mark. But the writer continues: "Day schools are not a necessity of its (the Connexion's) existence. They are important to it, and will hereafter be more so; but they are few in number, and it is highly probable that the proportion of their increase will be small for a considerable period, as the Connexion is in no degree dependent upon their establishment for the accomplishment of its specific work amongst the ignorant and degraded."*

To this remarkable utterance we reply: we believe with the writer, that day schools will increase but slowly amongst us as matters now stand. But this, we maintain, quite contrary to his view, speaks loudly for the need of such grants as he condemns, in order that the rate of increase may be accelerated. As to what is affirmed respecting day schools not being necessary in any sense for the accomplishment of our proper work among the degraded—to admit this would be, in effect, to say, that a good secular and religious education is of no consequence in relation to conversion, which would be like saying that seed time is of no consequence to harvest. And, besides the direct influence of education on the child, who does not know how the most hardened parents may be reached through their children? We admit that working upon the masses by this means is slow, tame, and rather expensive. There is nothing romantic or sensational about it. But nevertheless it is very effective, planting good where otherwise there would be evil; and hence it must be important in relation to evangelistic effort. We need say but little in reply to the remark that day schools are not a necessity of Connexional existence, for whoever would be content with mere existence while he could honourably get more than this?—which, it has been shown, we can do by obtaining educational grants.

In conclusion, let us just indicate the result of the argument. We have proved that as a denomination we may accept government grants without violating any principle of dissent, without conniving at any false system which receives them along with us, and also without sacrificing Connexional honour or independence. We have also shown that, as a body, we greatly need these grants to assist in bringing up our educational to something like equality with our evangelistic power, and enable us to train the children of the masses, whom, by God's help, we save. Are these principles founded in truth? Then the duty to accept grants is evident, while to continue in refusing them would be to stubbornly persevere in a course that is unsound in principle, and in practice very detrimental to the interests of the Connexion. As to the objection urged in the Conference that the reception of grants would necessitate the establishment of a normal

* "Christian Ambassador," p. 26.

school for the education of teachers, which would involve an amount of expense for which we are not prepared, we remark, it need not do this at present, as, for a time, teachers belonging to the Connexion might be obtained—teachers, we mean, that have been trained in one or other of the existing normal schools. There are at present many government schools belonging to bodies which have no normal schools, the teachers in which schools have been trained in existing colleges, or have stood successful examinations by inspectors while employed as pupil teachers. The same sources are open to us. If, however, the objection should be still urged, on the ground that a normal school must ultimately be required, we reply that the same difficulty is common to any comprehensive system of denominational education apart from the state, for it is evident that, were our day schools rapidly to increase, a sufficient supply of teachers could not be found without an institution to aid in training them. So that, unless we abandon the idea of trying to provide education for our children, the question is not whether we shall have a normal school or not, but whether we shall support one solely at our own expense, or ask government for grants to aid us in its support.

JOHN BARFOOT.

P.S.—"The expectation that the Congregational Dissenters would soon abandon their objections to State grants for *education* is already being realised. At a meeting of the leading ministers and laymen of the Blackburn district of the Congregational Union, a resolution was passed, with only one dissentient, recommending the churches of the denomination to avail themselves of the grants in aid of the Privy Council 'until a better system could be established.' It is possible, says the 'Nonconformist,' this advice will be generally taken. There is small chance that a system of secular education, supported by local rates, will, for a long time at least, be established in England, and Nonconformists are coming to the conclusion that they may consistently accept the Privy Council grant, provided that government inspection is not extended to religious education. It is certain that they have been quite beaten in their efforts to carry on day-schools on the purely voluntary principle. Some years ago large sums were subscribed for that object, and many schools were established, not one-tenth of which have, it is stated, been able to survive the rivalry of the Church schools aided by Parliamentary grants. Our State grant correspondents may profitably reflect on this aspect of the question."—*Methodist Times*, Sep. 23, 1867.

"It (the subject of State aid to Congregational schools) was introduced by the Rev. Mr. MacDougall, whose thoughtful and eloquent paper did justice at once to the principles of the question

and to the practical difficulties by which it is beset. He is in favour of solving them by handing over secular instruction to the State, reserving religious instruction as the province proper to the religious bodies; but in the meantime he urges the expediency of accepting government aid."—*Manchester Examiner*, Sep., 1867.

ART. V.—THE PRINCE CONSORT.

The Early Years of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. Compiled under the direction of Her Majesty the Queen, by Lieutenant-General the Hon. C. Grey. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1867.

The Speeches and Addresses of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. John Murray, Albermarle Street, 1864.

WE well remember the bright, brief, cold Sunday in December, 1861, when through the country the telegraph flashed intelligence that struck the hearts of millions with sorrow, and with something akin to dismay; the intelligence conveyed was that the Prince Consort, or as the people still called him, Prince Albert was dead! The official bulletin of the four eminent medical men in attendance at Windsor Castle, first made the country aware, on the 11th December, that the symptoms of the Prince's disease were serious if not threatening. He had for a fortnight been suffering from a severe cold, which increased in febrile appearance till the fatal typhoid set in. This disease is found to be the disease of early adult life, and prevails to a large extent among the upper and middle classes.

In this calamitous instance the tax upon the resistant and vital energies was very great. If these fail, the foe soon destroys the fortress. They quickly failed here, and the illustrious sufferer was laid low. Constitutionally the vital power was deficient in the Prince. All the other organs of life were in vigorous development, save the heart; its action had been from his youth comparatively feeble. For a day or two nature struggled desperately, the doctors anxiously watched the fluctuations of the conflict, and the appearance of every fresh symptom—now, hoping that the sufferer's strength of constitution and careful habit of life would, in this

dread hour, stand him in good stead; now despairing, as the disease waxed in fury. Within the last few hours they announced to the world that there was "some mitigation of the severity of the symptoms," and within an hour before death the Prince expressed himself as strong enough to get out of bed. But a last terrible access of the malady occasioned a dreadful fit of congestion of the lungs, which finally and fatally overmastered nature, and he departed from us to the "world unknown" he had so often spoken of, and so well prepared for. Toplady's beautiful hymn, "Rock of Ages," was frequently on his lips during the few last days of his life.

The intelligence that the Queen was a widow, and the royal children fatherless, affected the people of these realms as no other domestic event since the death of that national favourite—the Princess Charlotte, in 1817. It is true that in the interval three of our kings had died; one truly religious and honest though narrow and self-willed, but with division and vice in his family. His reign was long and troubled, his reason became eclipsed, and his last days were spent in mental and physical darkness. The next of the three kings, while called the "first gentleman of Europe," would not be wronged if described as among the first profligates of Europe. The third, though popular in the country, and in many respects the best of king George's sons, was not more than mediocre in intellect and attainment. But in the case of the Prince Consort the English people had latterly become aware of his rare qualities and noble gifts; that he, by his broad and generous views and statesmanlike counsel, was a pillar of strength to the Queen's throne. He disdained to dazzle, and scorned empty display, but he could win and command. He strove to make the Court of St. James one of the noblest in purity, moderation, and power. His own private life was so blameless that the foul breath of slander never reached him. One of the great aims of his life was to give a high moral tone to his children's tastes and character, and to make his household the very model of an English family. Gradually but surely had he won his way into the esteem of the nation, and by nothing more than his willing and hearty support of every movement and enterprise (not involving political partianship) promotive of the national weal. He had thus become endeared to the hearts of the people when he was smitten down before them; and the whole land mourned for him. He was many years in winning his popularity; there had prevailed unfounded suspicion that he unduly interfered in state questions, and that he was infringing upon the treasured rights of the parliament and the people. When the discontent was rife on one occasion, the Prime Minister of the day gave a full explanation to the parliament of the prince's conduct, which proved that no Englishman

valued the rights of the people more than he did. And even in the excitement of the Russian war, though he at first sided with Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Gladstone rather than with Lord Palmerston and the Turkish party, when the country was fully committed to the struggle, he gave the whole weight of his support to the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war. He was one of the few men who could be quiet in a storm of opposition, and bide his time. And when death took him from us we saw his importance and worth. How often do we fail to see the value of a man till he is removed. This is wrong. To honour, love, and admire good and noble men while they are amongst us is better than building their sepulchres, and rearing costly memorials to their name,—

> "What we have we prize not to the worth,
> While we enjoy it; but being lacked and lost,
> Why then we rack the value; then we find
> The virtue that possession would not show us."

So when death struck that midnight blow in the castle at Windsor, we felt the loss we had sustained; that blow fell upon the Queen with a terribleness that we can hardly realise. With her whole heart she had loved the husband of her youth, and her love grew with the lapse of years. Her soul was bound up in his; he was, to use her own expressive words,—"the life of her life!" Since his death she has never fully rallied from the overwhelming anguish of her loss. Sundry newspaper writers have frequently gratuitously lectured upon her withdrawal from "society," as if, after being crushed in the hope and joy of her very existence, she could flutter among the Dundrearies, the "curled darlings," and fine and fast ladies of "London society." The real duties of her exalted position have never been neglected, nor has she slighted any thing of national interest. All the Prince's cherished projects and enterprizes she has lovingly carried out, doing every thing to perpetuate his name and virtues, and lingering with fond affection in spots and scenes that he laid out or ornamented, or were favourite places with him. As an instance in proof, take this entry from the Queen's journal given in this volume:—"Balmoral, October 13th, 1856. Every year my heart becomes more fixed in this dear paradise, and so much the more so now that all has become my dearest Albert's *own* creation, own work, own building, own laying out, as at Osborne; that his great taste, and the impress of his dear hand have been stamped everywhere."

How different this union of love from the cold, formal, and often unhappy royal alliances in this and Continental countries. Within twelve months of his death Mr. Helps, the well known author of "Friends in Council," under the guiding hand of the Queen,

collected and published the speeches of the Prince. His estimate of his character prefixed is discriminating and able. Of these speeches we propose speaking further on in our writing. In the volume, whose title page we have transcribed at the head of this article, we have an instalment of the Prince's biography, in a handsome octavo volume of nearly five hundred pages. This volume recites the story of his life from his childhood to the first year after his marriage. Two portraits are given; one when he was four years old, the other when he was twenty. There is a shade of seriousness if not melancholy over both of these portraits. In the first the eyes are most expressive—beautifully soft and tender, while the face is that of a sensitive and intelligent child. There is an entire absence of every thing angular, hard, or coarse. The other portrait bears the same leading characteristics, only there is a strength and decision developed which of course is not seen in the first.

We need hardly say that criticism, as usually applied, would be out of place in dealing with this volume. Indeed, taking it as a wife's memorial to her honoured husband, remembering too that the Queen has placed all her letters, personal and private diaries, and memoranda, at the unrestricted disposal of the biographer, the Princess Helena having translated the German letters of her father's for this work—we say, remembering all this, criticism would be an impertinence, if not an outrage. We cannot but commend the way in which General Grey has executed his delicate and difficult task. Though not a professional or practised literateur he has displayed a skill, exercised a moderation, and written in a style that greatly adds to the value and interest of the volume. The completion of the work in volumes, to be published, is committed to the competent hands of Mr. Theodore Martin. In our review of this book we shall allow it, as frequently and fully as we can, to speak for itself in its own words. From the preface we learn that the original design of Her Majesty was only to circulate the work among the members of her own family, and a few others whose relation to the Prince Consort warranted its being given to them. But as General Grey says, "There was felt to be considerable danger of a copy being surreptitiously obtained and published, possibly, in a garbled form, and the question arose whether it might not be expedient to avert this danger by publishing it in substantially the same form as that in which it was first printed for private circulation." Accordingly Her Majesty agreed to make the work public, "believing that the free and unreserved expression which the volume contains of her own feelings, as well as those of the Prince, is such as if made public (however unusual such publicity may be) will command the entire sympathy of every one whose sympathy or good opinion is to be desired." Whoever

advised the Queen to publish this book did wisely to advise that restraint should be thrown off, and free use made of all documents, even those which relate to her marriage and personal feelings, for this free confidence bestowed upon the people will vastly enhance the esteem, reverence, and love for the Queen's person, and the memory of the lamented Prince. We know that it is an unusual, and sometimes a dangerous, thing to publish such documents while most of the parties concerned are living, or even in the same generation; but there was no danger in this instance, for the most prurient eye can find little or nothing to take exception to; and without these letters and documents we could not have understood the true character of this Prince, so deeply lamented by the people,—this husband and father, so inconsolably deplored by his family. Most of the Queen's notes and records, as our readers will see in the extracts we give in this article, are written in the artlessness and fullness of a woman's first and only love. Some of the notes are about things of trifling import, but let us remember that nothing is small to a great love. No royal pageant could so have brought the Queen into the midst of her people as this frank and candid taking the people into her full and private confidence,—into her heart and home; for here we see not only the mere externals of the Prince's life, but get an insight into his qualities; his motives are unveiled, and we are permitted to see even his secret thoughts, as well as the Queen's. We see, too, as far as this volume takes us, how his life was woven into the great web of history, and made its proper line in the pattern worked upon it.

The volume commences with a brief account of the Sax-Coburg family. Among his direct ancestors were Frederick the Wise, who nobly threw his shield around Luther; and Frederick the Magnanimous, whose attachment to the Protestant faith cost him his electorate. Prince Albert's father was Duke Ernest of Sax-Coburg-Saalfeld. There is not much direct mention of Duke Ernest in this book, yet it is evident that his affection for his children was devoted, and he was anxiously alive to his responsibilities in relation to their training and education.

His mother was the Princess Louise, of Sax-Gotha-Attenburg. The union was any thing but happy through incompatibility. In the Queen's memoranda we find the Princess Louise thus spoken of:—"The Princess is described as having been very handsome, though very small, fair and blue eyes, and Prince Albert is said to have been extremely like her. An old servant who had known her for many years, told the Queen that when she first saw the Prince in 1844 she was quite overcome by the resemblance to his mother. She was full of cleverness and talent, but the marriage was not a happy one, and a separation took place in 1824, when she left

Coburg and never saw her children again. She died at St. Wendel, 1831, after a long and painful illness in her thirty-second year. The Prince never forgot her, and spoke with much tenderness and sorrow of his poor mother. One of the first gifts he made to the Queen was a little pin he had received from her when a child. The Princess Louise is said to be like her grandmother, and is named after her."

Prince Albert was the second son; Ernest, the elder, is now the energetic Grand Duke of Sax-Coburg. They were born at Rosenau Palace, the summer residence of the Duke, near Coburg. For their early training they were thrown upon their excellent grandmother, the dowager Duchess of Coburg, and most faithfully and affectionately did she discharge those duties which a mother delights to perform. The old lady's letters to her daughter, the Duchess of Kent, are filled with rapturous descriptions of the excellencies of the children. Her Majesty in speaking of this fine old lady says:—"The Queen remembers her dear grandmother perfectly well. She was a most remarkable woman, with a masculine mind, accompanied with great tenderness of heart, and love for nature. * * * She was adored by her children, particularly by her sons, king Leopold being her great favourite. She had fine and most expressive blue eyes, with the marked features and long nose inherited by most of her children and grand-children." A great many interesting details are given in this volume of the first few years of Prince Albert's life. His mother, when he was eight months old waxes eloquent in describing him, and says:—"He is superb, of an extraordinary beauty, having great blue eyes, a dainty little mouth and dimples on each cheek; he is very lively, has three teeth, is already begining to walk," &c. At two years his grandmother declares that her "Little Alberinchen, with his large blue eyes and dimpled cheeks was quite bewitching, forward, quick as a weasel, and able to say any thing very handsome, but too slight for a boy; very funny, all good nature and full of mischief," &c. When a child he "showed dislike to be in the charge of women," and further on in the volume, the Queen, in one of her many notes, says that all through life he strongly disliked paying formal attention to court ladies. He could not stoop to talk the vapid prettinesses they so much delight in. He was not the "nice man" after their heart, who would spend hours in silly gossip.

Knowing what we do of Duke Ernest, Albert's elder brother, we confess to some astonishment at discovering from this book that in youth Albert was fiery, energetic, directing, and self asserting, while his brother was comparatively gentle and submissive; for in manhood Ernest has manifested energy to exuberance, while Albert ripened into the calmness and impartiality of wisdom. Here

the poetic dicta, so well known, does not hold good,—that the child is father of the man. The following rather lengthy extract from the memoranda of his principle tutor shows in many important things the contrariety of the child and the man. Herr Florschutz says:—"The lively spirits with which he at once entered into the games of childhood, or the more serious occupations of youth, spoke the healthy tone of mind and body. The children breakfasted with their parents between nine and ten. * * * Dinner, which till his eleventh year Prince Albert had regularly alone with his brother or tutor, was at one o'clock. Between four and five, when the Duke's dinner was over, he had to appear before the company, after which he paid a visit to his grandmother, the Dowager Duchess Augusta; and no morning passed, when at Gotha, without a visit to his maternal grandmother. At seven o'clock the Prince supped, and was glad to retire to bed. An irresistible feeling of sleepiness would come over him in the evening, which he found it difficult to resist even in after life, and even his most cherished occupations, or the liveliest games were, at such times, ineffectual to keep him awake. If prevented from going to bed he would suddenly disappear, and was generally found sleeping quietly in the recess of the window—for repose of some kind, though but for a quarter of an hour, was then indispensable. On one occasion—the first I was present at his supper—the young Prince suddenly fell asleep and tumbled off his chair, but was not hurt, and continued to sleep quietly on the ground. * * * Though the Prince's health was generally good, he had more than one illness, and was subject to serious and sometimes alarming attacks of croup, which the most trifling cause, the slightest cold, was sufficient to bring on. These attacks of croup were of frequent occurrence up to his tenth year, and often occasioned a hoarseness which lasted several days, and gave him much annoyance.

"In his early youth Prince Albert was very shy, and he had long to struggle against this feeling. He disliked visits from strangers, and at their approach would run to the furthest corner of the room, and cover his face with his hands; nor was it possible to make him look up or speak a word. If his doing so was insisted upon he resented to the utmost, screeming violently. On one occasion, on a child's fancy ball given by the Duchess, Prince Albert, then in his fifth year, was brought down, and a little girl was selected as his partner, but when it came to his turn to move on, after the other dancers, nothing could induce him to stir, and his loud screams were heard echoing through the rooms. Even with his brother the Prince showed, at this time rather too strong a will of his own, and for several years this disposition came out at times. Surpassing his brother in thoughtful earnestness, in

calm reflection, and self command, and evincing, at the same time more prudence in action, it was only natural that his will should prevail, and when compliance with it was not voluntarily yielded, he was sometimes disposed to have recourse to compulsion.

"The distinguishing characteristics of the Prince's disposition were his winning cheerfulness and his endearing amiability. His disposition was always to take a cheerful view of life, and to see its best side. He was fond of fun and practical jokes, and on one occasion drew down from his father a scolding by getting his instructor in chemistry to fill a number of small glass vessels, about the size of a pea, with sulphurated hydrogen, which he threw about the floor of the pit and boxes of the theatre, to the great annoyance and discomfiture of the audience, at whose confusion he was highly delighted."

There is a very interesting letter from the Prince's cousin, Count Mensdorff, from which we select the following:—"Albert, as a child, was of a mild, benevolent disposition. It was only what he thought unjust or dishonest that could make him angry. Thus, I recollect one day when we children, Albert, Ernest, Ferdinend, Augustus, Alexander, and myself, and a few other boys were playing at the Rosenau, and some of us were to storm the old ruined tower on the side of the castle, which the others were to defend. One of us suggested that there was a place at the back by which we could get in without being seen, and thus capture it without difficulty. Albert declared that 'This would be most unbecoming in a Saxon knight, who should always attack the enemy in front,' and so we fought for the tower so honestly and vigorously, that Albert, by mistake, for I was on his side, gave me a blow upon the nose of which I still bear the mark. I need not say how sorry he was for the wound he had given me. . . . From his earliest infancy he was distinguished for his perfect moral purity, both in word and in deed; and to this he owed the sweetness of his disposition. . . . While he was very young, his heart was feelingly alive to the sufferings of the poor. I saw him one day give a beggar something by stealth, when he told me not to speak of it, 'for when you give to the poor,' he said, 'you must see that nobody knows it.'"

The brothers were fortunate in Herr Florschutz as a tutor; he laid in them the foundations of extensive, if not profound, learning. The brothers were constant companions up to manhood, and they cherished for each other the strongest affection. Just before his brother's marriage, the Duke Ernest wrote to her Majesty, "Albert," he said, "is my second self, and my heart is one with his. Independently of his being my brother, I love and esteem him more than any one on earth." And the Queen's truly feminine use of expletives shows the existence of this fraternal affection. "Ernest's sincere pleasure," she wrote to the King of the Belgians, announc-

ing her engagement, "gives me great delight. He does so adore dearest Albert."

When the Prince was seventeen, he with his brother and father made a tour through Prussia, Bohemia, and Austria. They finished their tour by a visit to London. For the first time he saw his future wife, the Princess Victoria. They visited each other frequently, yet there was no affection of a tender character between them. In writing home he coldly speaks of his cousin as being merely amiable. It is manifest, however, that this fair cousin was struck in this visit by the nobleness and purity of his character, for she says:—"The Prince was much shorter than his brother. . . . . He was most amiable, natural, unaffected, and merry; full of interest in everything—playing on the piano with the princess, his cousin—drawing, in short, constantly occupied. He always paid the greatest attention to all he saw, and the Queen remembers well how intently he listened to a sermon preached in St. Paul's, when he, his father, and brother accompanied the Duchess of Kent and the Princess there, on the occasion of the service attended by the children of different charity schools. It is indeed rare to see a Prince not yet seventeen years of age, bestowing such earnest attention on a sermon."

On their return to Coburg the two young men entered the University of Bonn. They had both been hard students, but Albert's devotement to intellectual labour was all absorbing. His father proposed a holiday, but the student could not afford the time. He writes: "Our course of study would be quite disturbed by such an interruption."

The chief subjects of their study at Bonn were eminently fitted to prepare him for the high station he was afterward called to fill. His curriculum comprehended Roman law, state rights, political economy, and the principles of finance. He attended two courses of lectures by Lobell and W. A. Von Schlegel, and a philosophical lecture by Fichte. He had no great relish for physical exercises; though he was an accomplished horseman, yet he never delighted in equestrian exercise. And once during his college career he was in great danger through a horse refusing to leap, his leg was severely injured, and we learn from the Queen's note that his knee ever after retained the deep scar from this accident. This distaste for bodily exercise grew upon him. He lacked animal vivacity, vigour, and resource. The late hours of state dinners, balls, and other state festivities, were oppressive to him, though he always struggled against it, and for duty's sake denied himself. "Nothing could exceed the kind attention," says the Queen, "he paid to every one, frequently standing the whole night that no one might be slighted."

A year after his first visit to England his cousin had become, by the death of William the Fourth, Queen of England. He wrote

her a letter of congratulation in English which will, we think, be read with interest:—"Bonn, 26 June, 1837.—My dearest cousin, I must write you a few lines to present you my sincerest felicitations on that great change which has taken place in your life. Now you are Queen of the mightiest land of Europe, in your hand lies the happiness of millions. May heaven assist and strengthen you with strength in that high but difficult task. I hope that your reign may be long, happy, and glorious, and that your efforts may be rewarded by the thankfulness and love of your subjects. May I pray you to think likewise sometimes of your cousins in Bonn, and to continue that kindness you favoured them with till now? Be assured that our minds are always with you, I will not be indiscreet and abuse your time. Believe me always your Majesty's most obedient and faithful servant.—ALBERT."

A month afterwards he writes to his father: "Uncle Leopold has written to me a great deal about England, and what is going on there. United as all parties are in high praise of the young Queen, the more do they seem to manœuvre and intrigue with and against each other. On every side there is nothing but a network of cabals and intrigues, and parties are arrayed against each other in this inexplicable manner."

That industrious jade, "public gossip," had been for some time busy with the names of the Princess and her cousin. So King Leopold, who had set his heart upon the union, thinking his plan might be frustrated, advised that the Coburg Princes should take a prolonged tour through Switzerland and Italy. In 1838 they set off, attended by Baron Stockmar, a faithful adherent of the Coburg house, and General Seymour, who became one of the Prince's attendants through life. Prince Albert sent his cousin a small book containing views of the places he visited. From Righi he sent a dried "rose des Alpes," and from Voltaire's house at Ferney, a scrap of the great sceptic's hand writing. "The whole of these," the Queen states, in tender, touching simplicity, "were placed in a small album, with the dates at which each place was visited in the Princess's own hand writing; and this album the Queen now considers one of her greatest treasures, and never goes anywhere without it."

In his visit to the Eternal City he records his disappointment in the plain, dingy, German-like look everything but the great works of art had to him. The queenly Florence delighted him. Its air of refinement, its unsurpassed works of art, its palatial buildings, the extreme beauty of surrounding scenery, and the clearness of the atmosphere, all filled him with a sense of delight.

We now approach the event that makes the life of this German prince so interesting to Englishmen—his marriage with our Queen. From the first year of his life it had been told him he

was to marry his cousin the Princess Victoria; and as it became more likely that she would be queen, he was frequently indulged with the glittering prospect of ruling England. His grandmother and uncle, Leopold, had set their hearts upon the marriage. The King of the Belgians was one of the most sagacious men and skilled diplomats of his day, and never was a project more skillfully managed than this. Both parties were carefully but sufficiently plied. The Queen expressed herself favourably in the matter to his Majesty in the early part of 1838. William the Fourth stoutly opposed the union; he wished her to marry Prince Alexander of Orange, a brother to the King of Holland. This was resisted by the Duchess of Kent and the King of Belgium; and "the Sailor King" was no match for the astute Leopold. This opposition on the part of the King was continued for some time, though the amiable Queen Adelaide afterwards told the Queen that the King would have given way directly had he known that his niece's happiness had been involved in the case. With the Queen's knowledge, King Leopold laid the project formally before the Prince; but the Queen was decidedly averse to an early marriage, on the ground of their youth. To the faithful Stockmar, Leopold writes: —"I had a long conversation with Albert, and put the whole case honestly before him. He looks at the question from its most elevated and honourable point of view. He considers that troubles are inseparable from all human positions. . . . . I have told him that his great youth would make it necessary to postpone the marriage for a few years. . . . . I found him very sensible on all these points. But one thing he observed with truth, 'I am ready,' he said, 'to submit to this delay, if I have only some certain assurance to go upon. But if, after waiting, perhaps for three years, I should find that the Queen no longer desired marriage, it would place me in a very ridiculous position, and would, to a certain extent, ruin all the prospects of my future life.'" The resolution of the Prince not to allow the matter to remain an open question must be commended. But the *naivete* of a German princeling, with not £300 per year, moralising on the troubles, plagues, and annoyances of £30,000 a year, and the hand of the youthful Queen of England, is somewhat amusing. The Queen's note upon her desire for this delay is very expressive. She says: —"She thought herself still too young, and also wished the Prince to be older when he made his appearance in England. In after years she often regretted this decision on her part, and constantly deplored the consequent delay of her marriage. Had she been engaged to the Prince a year sooner than she was, and had she married him at least six months earlier, she would have escaped many trials and troubles of different kinds." When the Queen pleaded for delay, and refused to make any formal contract, the

Prince thought it was expressive of her desire to be released from the engagement altogether. But that such was not the case, let the emphatic words of her Majesty testify:—"The Queen never entertained any idea of this, and she afterwards repeatedly informed the Prince that she would never have married any one else. . . . Nor can the Queen now think, without indignation against herself, of her wish to keep the Prince waiting for probably three or four years, at the risk of ruining all his prospects for life, until she might feel inclined to marry! . . . . The only excuse the Queen can make for herself is in the fact that the sudden change from the secluded life at Kensington to the independence of her position as Queen Regnant, at the age of eighteen, put all ideas of marriage out of her mind, which she now most bitterly repents. A worse school for a young girl, or one more detrimental to all natural feelings and affections, cannot well be imagined than the position of a queen at eighteen, without experience and without a husband to guide and support her. This the Queen can state from painful experience, and she thanks God that none of her dear daughters are exposed to such a danger."

This self-reproach seems almost needless, but it arises from the strength and humility of loving memories. So candid and intensely personal confession has, as far as we know, never been made before by any one in so exalted a position. And though we may think the self-reproach needless, yet as the out-come of a truly loving heart, we accept it as becoming our Queen as much as her crown.

In October, 1839, the Prince came to England with the purpose, as he afterwards told the Queen, of getting a final decision from her. His reception at Windsor was gracious and flattering on the part of the Queen, and his noble qualities seem to have fully won her heart. In the three years since her Majesty had seen him he had greatly improved in his personal appearance. Somewhat tall in figure, and manly in deportment, he was pronounced to be an eminently handsome man. There was a gentleness and sweetness in his expression, and yet intellectual power was deeply stamped upon his countenance. The present writer distinctly remembers being impressed with his appearance about twelve months after his marriage. The purity, earnestness, and intellectuality of his countenance were striking. It was to be seen that he could not stoop to vice or flattery. His high, well-developed forehead, his deep-set blue eyes, the serious cast of the features (except when relaxed with a gracious smile), all told that he was not one of the pretty pets of modern society, not a trifler, a flippant scorner, a gilded nothing, but an earnest, gentle, intellectual man. A week after his arrival at Windsor, the Queen informed him that she had decided upon marriage, and freely offered him her heart and her hand. We quote General Grey's account of the affair:—"On the

15th of October, there was an important interruption to the ordinary routine of the day. The Queen had told Lord Melbourne the day before that she had made up her mind to the marriage, at which he expressed great satisfaction, saying to her, 'I think it will be very well received, for I hear that there is a great anxiety that it should be;' adding, in quite a paternal tone, 'you will be much more comfortable, for a woman cannot stand alone for any time, in whatever position she may be.' Can we wonder that the Queen, recalling these circumstances, should exclaim, 'Alas! alas! the poor Queen now stands in that position.' An intimation was given to the Prince that the Queen wished to speak to him the next day. About one o'clock he obeyed the Queen's summons to her room, where he found her alone. After a few minutes' conversation on other subjects, the Queen told him why she had sent for him; and we can well understand any little hesitation and delicacy she may have felt in doing so; for the Queen's position, making it imperative that any proposal of marriage should come first from her, must necessarily appear a painful one to those who, deriving their ideas on this subject from the practice of private life, are wont to look upon it as the happiness and privilege of a woman to have her hand sought in marriage, instead of having to offer it herself."

The same day the Queen writes to her uncle Leopold concerning the morning's interview thus:—"My mind is quite made up, and I told Albert of it this morning. The warm affection he showed on learning this gave me great pleasure. He seems perfection, and I think I have the prospect of very great happiness before me. I love him MORE than I can say, and shall do everything in my power to render this sacrifice (for such in my opinion it is) as small as I can. He seems to have great tact, a very necessary thing in his position. These last few days have passed like a dream to me, and I am so bewildered by it all that I hardly know how to write; but I do feel very happy. It is absolutely necessary that this determination of mine should be known to no one but yourself and to Uncle Ernest until after the meeting of Parliament, as it would be considered otherwise neglectful on my part not to have assembled Parliament at once to inform them of it. . . . . We (that is Lord Melbourne and the Queen) also think it better, and Albert quite approves of it, that we should be married very soon after the Parliament meets, about the beginning of February."

We cannot forbear quoting a part of the reply of the wise king, "In your position, which may and will become more difficult in a political point of view, you could not EXIST without having a happy and agreeable *interieur*. And I am much deceived (which I think I am not) or you will find in Albert just the very qualities and disposition which are indispensible to your happiness. You say,

most amiably, that you consider it a sacrifice on the part of Albert. This is true in many points, because his position will be a difficult one; but much, I may say *all*, will depend upon your affection for him. If YOU *love* him and are *kind* to him, he will easily bear the bothers of his position."

The letter of the Prince to the "faithful" Stockmar, is tinged with rhapsodical sentiment, nothing unusual with young people in such circumstances. He quotes a couplet from the beautiful lyric of Schiller's song of the Bell as expressive of his "bewilderment,"

> "The eye sees heaven open before it,
> The heart feels floods of bliss rush o'er it."

The ever affectionate grandmother is duly informed of the Queen's declaration. The Prince writes her:—"The subject which has occupied us so much of late is at last settled. The Queen sent for me alone to her room, a few days ago, and declared to me in a genuine outburst of love and affection, that I had gained her whole heart, and it would make her intensely happy if I would make her the sacrifice of sharing her life; the only thing which troubled her was that she did not think she was worthy of me. The joyous openness of manner in which she told me, this quite enchanted me and I was quite carried away by it; she is really most good and amiable, and I am quite sure heaven has not given me into evil hands, and that we shall be happy together. Since that moment Victoria does whatever she fancies I should wish or like, and we talk together a great deal about our future life. . . . . The period of our marriage is already close at hand. The Queen and the Ministers wish exceedingly that it should take place in the first days of February, in which I acquiesced, after hearing the reasons for it. . . . . My position here will be very pleasant, inasmuch as I have refused all offers of titles, I keep my own name and remain what I was. This makes me very independent, and makes it easy to run over occasionally and see my dear relations."

When the Prince returned to Germany, before his marriage, the Queen corresponded constantly with him. Of these letters, the Queen now says: "That they are the greatest treasures now in her possession. During this time," writes her Majesty, "precedents were searched for to see what the Prince's household should consist of, and, unfortunately, the one commonly referred to was that of Prince George of Denmark, the very stupid and insignificant husband of Queen Anne. He was a peer, and also, for some time, Lord High Admiral of England, but he seems never to have played anything but a subordinate part."

From the same royal hand we have a frank but touching account of her interview with her privy councillors, to whom, according to state requirements she had to communicate the intelligence of her

approaching marriage. The same announcement was made to the parliament, which she opened in person, on the 16th of January, 1840. On the 10th of the ensuing month the marriage took place with due pomp and circumstance.

Shortly after his marriage the Prince, in writing to a companion says:—"My future is brilliant and high, but also plentifully strewed with thorns; struggles will not be wanting; the month of March already appears to have storms in store." The storms hurtled and grew as he had forseen. At that time political partizanship was rife and bitter. The Whigs had long been in influence, but their power was waning and their parliamentary majority getting less every week. The marriage of the Queen was enthusiastically celebrated through the country, but many of the arrangements were made by the Whigs; so at all possible points the wary and furious Tories used every means to defeat and annoy them, and in one or two instances they caused her Majesty pain and annoyance. She generously and candidly admits in this volume that up to her marriage she had been herself a strong Whig partizan; but through the influence of the Prince, aided by that large-hearted and able statesman Lord Melbourne, she withdrew from faction, intrigue, and even from political parties. Lord Melbourne, after reasoning with the Queen about being so irate with the Tories said, "You should now hold out the olive branch a little."

On two subjects the Tories succeeded in defeating the Whigs, and causing the Court pain and vexation; one in reducing the Prince's annuity from £50,000 to £30,000. This was done on the motion of that rabidiest of Tories, Colonel Sibthorp; the other was in throwing out the clauses of the bill giving the Queen's Consort rank next after the Sovereign. This step carried in party spite could benefit no one at the time, but the insignificant king of Hanover. Then what is known as the "Bed-chamber Plot" intensified the Queen's dislike to the Tories. Sir Robert Peel had thrown up the reins of government because the Queen would not, with the change of government, change the ladies in immediate attendance upon her. The refusal of the Queen was conveyed in this curt note:—"The Queen, having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel, to remove the ladies of her bed-chamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings." Through the gentle but powerful control of the Prince, this was the last unseemly manifestation of party spirit in the palace. Not that he believed that the existence of parties in the legislature or state to be necessarily evil and politically immoral; but he held that it derogated from the dignity of the crown to be mixed up in intrigues and political squabbles. He kept aloof

from party strife not merely from motives of expediency but from a natural dislike to them. Heated partizanship is an impossibility to men of his constitution. One of the prominent qualities of his mental character was serenity. His mind was judicial in its cast. He must view and examine things not as an advocate, to make the most of his side, but as a whole, in its broad and several relations. Hence the rough and tumble party fights, and petty intrigue disgusted him. His calm, but quick and powerful mind gradually impressed the statesmen of England, till he grew to be one of the greatest, though unseen powers in the realm. It became a saying ultimately, that three powers governed this country—the Prince Consort, Lord Palmerston, and the "Times."

The demeanour and influence of the Prince are well set forth by General Grey in this volume, in the chapter "The first year of marriage," and we cannot do better than give his well chosen words: "It must be admitted, however, that constantly, unostentatiously, and perseveringly as he now gave himself up to the discharge of his new duties, he was exposed almost during the whole of his life in this country to much misconception and much misrepresentation. Not for that, however, did he for one moment relax his efforts, or allow his zeal to flag in seeking to promote all that was for the good of the British people. His actions might be misunderstood, his opinions might be misrepresented (of which there was more than one notable instance) [NOTE by the QUEEN, especially at the commencement of the Russian war] but, supported by his own conscious rectitude, he still pursued the even tenor of his way. Not a complaint, not a murmur ever escaped his lips; not a single hasty expression did he ever indulge in, even towards those who were most unjust to him. He accepted such injustice as the inevitable lot of one placed, as he was, in a high station, trusting surely to the coming of the time when his motives would be better understood by his adopted country. The principle on which he always acted was (to use his own noble words) "to sink his own individual existence in that of his wife, to aim at no power by himself or for himself, to shun all ostentation, to assume no separate responsibility before the public; but, making his position entirely a part of the Queen's, continually and anxiously to watch every part of the public business, in order to be able to advise and assist her any moment in any of the multifarious and difficult questions brought before her, sometimes political or social, or personal, as the natural head of her family; superintendent of her household, manager of her private affairs, her sole confidential adviser in politics, and only assistant in her communications with the officers of the government."

It was not, however, for some time that the position above described could be assumed. For the first year or two the Prince

was not, except upon rare occasions, and by special invitation present at the interviews of the Queen with her ministers—[NOTE by the QUEEN: "But this was not from any objections on their part"]—though taking, the Queen says, great pains to inform himself about everything, "and though Lord Melbourne expressed much anxiety that the Queen should tell him, and show him everything connected with public affairs."

Nor were there wanting those who would gladly have kept him estranged from public business, and not only so, but who would have denied him, even in domestic circles, that authority which in private families properly belongs to the husband. The Prince himself saw the necessity of his asserting that authority. "In my home life," he writes to a companion of his youth, "I am very happy, but the difficulty of filling my place with proper dignity is, that I am only the husband, not the master, in the house." But thanks to the love that bound the royal couple in mutual confidence; thanks, too, to the firmness of the Prince in asserting his proper position as the head of the family, there was no real difference on the subject. To those who would urge upon the Queen that as sovereign she must be the head of the family as well as the state, and that her husband, after all, was only one of her subjects, her Majesty would reply, "that she had solemnly engaged at the altar to "obey," as well as to "love and honour," and this sacred obligation she could neither consent to limit nor refine away." From the first, upon the advice of Lord Melbourne, she communicated all foreign despatches to the Prince. And he says, "I try quietly to be of as much use to the Queen as I can." Here, then, is the noble principle upon which he acted all through his life, "Sinking his individual existence in that of the Queen." Slowly, but surely, acting on that principle did he establish his position, and so entirely was it recognised by the Queen herself, so unreservedly and confidingly did she throw herself upon her husband's support, relying, in all questions of difficulty, upon his judgment, and acting in all things by his advice, that, when suddenly bereaved of that support, her sense of the loss which she had sustained as Queen, found expression in the pathetic words, "That it would now be, in fact, the beginning of a new reign."

We have in an interesting letter written to his grandmother an account of the attempt made by Edward Oxford, upon the life of the Queen, only four months after their marriage, which only consideration of space prevents us quoting. Many other events are noticed in this volume, the last and not the least interesting is the birth of the Princess Royal.

At the end of the book there is an ably written monograph by king Leopold, on the history of the house of Coburg, and his own marriage and position in England. Writing in his old age, with

his second wife's children grown up around him, and peacefully swaying a sceptre over a loyal and united people, and looked upon as the Nestor of European sovereigns, he declares that he never recovered the feelings of happiness, which had blessed his short married life in England, with our Princess Charlotte. Her death took him from the very position his nephew filled. In this writing George the Fourth comes off very badly. Proof is here given of his unnatural neglect of the Duchess of Kent and her daughter. The King relates a visit he paid to his wife's mother, Queen Caroline, during her trial, and says, for it George the Fourth never forgave him; declaring he would never see him again. However, the Duke of York arranged an interview, and the King occupied nearly the whole time of the interview with paltry questions as to how the Queen was dressed, and other trivialities. King Leopold gives expression to the reluctance with which he declined the crown of Greece, because the frontier did not satisfy him; and two years after that very line of frontier was adopted. He also urged upon the English government the annexation of Crete to the new kingdom, but Lord Aberdeen vetoed the proposal. But the deadly war now raging in that island shows that Leopold was right and the British foreign secretary wrong in the step. Vain as it is we cannot help expressing our deep regret that the new Greek kingdom did not fall into the hands of Prince Leopold, instead of those of the half imbecile Otho. Here is the note appended by her Majesty:—"The Queen well remembers her joy when this took place, as she adored her uncle, and was in despair at the thought of his departure for Greece."

But we turn, before we conclude, to the speeches of the Prince Consort. It must be said that in range of thought, in opulent diction, in rhetorical embellishment, in majesty and power they cannot compare with the speeches of Burke, Fox, Pitt, Shiel, Wilberforce, Macaulay, or Gladstone. Yet as the utterances of a highly gifted and cultured mind they are fresh, striking, and suggestive. They are more suggestive than informing. They are condensed to the smallest compass. To enlarge, multiply, and amplify has been called the besetting sin of orators. These speeches avoid this sin, yet they are often exhaustive; grasping the soul of the subject, so to speak, rather than multiplying splendid verbiage. His speech at York, when several of the other speakers of the day were England's foremost orators and statesmen, was said by judges, by no means lenient to the Prince, to compare favourably with the best efforts of the occasion. His foreign accent, and his inability to speak often, were drawbacks to his oratorical efforts. In these speeches there is an entire absence of the usual alloy in such productions; no ran-

cour; no thunder of denunciation; no tirades of personality or abuse; no small jokes, or worse witticisms; no attempt at parade in constructing fine sentences; no platitudes dressed up in grand diction. He spoke because he had something to say, not because he had to say something. Of course they "smell of the lamp." They bear unmistakeable marks of careful preparation. But this is reasonable and right. His position made him careful not to trust to the contingences of the moment, lest he should compromise himself and her, whose fame, welfare, and life were bound up with his own. Besides this, his intellectual habit of thinking every thing out, surveying it in all possible aspects, as well as his respect for his audiences, made him careful even to anxiety in his preparations for public addresses. So that when he spoke his hearers had not the light chaff of the instant, but the best growth of his cultured and vigorous mind. He very often says striking, even brilliant things, without seeming to know it, and his learning instead of being laid on is often wrought into the very texture of his speeches. Nothing would please us more than to quote many instances of what we have said, but our space is nearly exhausted. Out of a number of places marked for transcription, the following two must suffice. At an educational meeting, he says:—"Man alone is born into this world with faculties far nobler than the other creatures, reflecting the image of him who has willed that there should be beings on earth to know and worship him, but endowed with the power of self-determination, having reason given him for his guide. He can develop his faculties, place himself in harmony with his divine Prototype, and attain that happiness which is offered him on earth, to be completed and consummated hereafter in entire union with him through the mercy of Christ." From the president's chair of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, an office which he accounted one of the chief distinctions of his life, he delivered an address which will not suffer by comparison with the best of the noble displays of eloquence and reasoning from that chair. We have only room for the last sentence. He has been speaking of the meeting of philosopher, artist, and physcist in their Association, testing the truth of their positions, and the accuracy of their observations, and contends that in all they were only humble seekers after truth, and thus concludes:—"Neither are they daring and unpresumptious unbelievers,—a character which ignorance has sometimes affixed to them, who, like the Titans, storm heaven by placing mountain upon mountain, till hurled down from the height attained by the terrible thunders of outraged Jove; but rather the pious pilgrims to the Holy Land, who toil on in search of the sacred shrine; in search of truth;

God's truth; God's laws as manifested in his works,—in his creation."

Here then we conclude our brief survey of this pure and noble life; a life unique in its goodness and nobleness. He disliked, and as much as in him lay, shunned the "painted pleasures of a court." The society of his wife and family, intercourse with good and great men, communion with nature, the ennobling pursuits of art and scientific research and discovery, and works of benevolence for the masses,—these were his positive delight. Instead of visiting "society" in London, he was commonly found in the studio of the artist, the museum, or working in some benevolent institution. He had much of the true artist's spiritual insight, skill, and enthusiasm. In painting and music his taste approached very near to genius. In the country he had a keen appreciative eye for the striking or beautiful in the aspects of nature. He loved the song of the wild birds. The Queen notes in her memoranda how at Osborne they were accustomed to walk alone at night, and how he often expressed his delight in the rich melody of the song of the nightingale, and how he got to be able to imitate its notes with such perfection that often the very birds were deceived, and she says, that she never hears the note of the nightingale now without being deeply affected by the memory of these nocturnal rambles.

It would be absurd to call this Prince a great man. The epithet is often used with very slender reason and sometimes in defiance of reason. The great are those who are extraordinarly gifted by nature, and who fully develop their noblest powers, and who thus bow communities or nations to their sway. In the greatness of goodness we think Prince Albert has not been surpassed, seldom approached. In intellectual endowment he was high above the crowd of learned or intellectual men. But among the highest few strict truth compels us to say he must not be placed; impartial history will not designate him as Albert the Great, but it will delight to write his style and title as ALBERT THE GOOD. In a beautiful poem the Poet Laureate has described the character and sung the virtues of the Prince; a few lines of which we give:—

"We know him now; all narrow jealousies
Are silent; and we see him as he moved,
How modest, kindly, accomplish'd, wise,
With what sublime repression of himself,
And in what limits, and how tenderly;
Not swaying to this faction or to that;
Not making his high place the lawless perch
Of winged ambitions nor a vantage-ground
For pleasure; but thro' all this tract of years
Wearing the white flower of a blameless life,
Before a thousand peering littlenesses,

In that fierce light which beats upon a throne,
And blackens every blot: for where is he
Who dares foreshadow for an only son
A lovelier life, a more unstained throne?
Or how should England, dreaming of *his* sons,
Hope more for these than some inheritance
Of such a life, a heart, a mind as thine,
Thou noble father of her kings to be."

E. H.

ART. VI.—THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE.

Lectures on the Science of Language, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, by MAX MULLER, M.A., (First Series). London: Longman.

FROM a very early date, men have been wont to go into raptures about language; to dwell on the mystery of vocalised breath being able to express perception, feeling, and all the subtle distinctions of thought; to touch on the complexity of its structure, and then to expatiate on the wonderful fact how the mind, nevertheless, can instantaneously single out from the copious stores of speech those words most proper to the immediate occasion; how it can grasp these, marshal them in sentences, and use them as the apt medium of conveying to others all that it thinks and feels, desires and determines. Some of the finest pieces of writing ever penned are in praise of language. Yet most things had been closely and scientifically examined before it. Other sciences had reached adolescence, or maturity, before that of language was born. It has grown up within the last fifty or sixty years, through the labours of Humboldt, Grimm, Bopp, Bunsen, and others.

In the course of its development, each science seems to pass through what may be termed the Empirical, Classificatory, and Theoretical stages. As a general rule, sciences, like human beings, must creep before they run. However lofty and abstract they may now appear; however little disposed to soil their fingers with the menial pursuits of life, yet, in their beginnings, they were simple and homely enough. The first geometricians, as the name assures us, were field measurers. Farmers and sailors were the first astronomers,

making the stars and planets subserve the interests of agriculture and navigation. To the primitive mariners, the fixed stars were really steadfast, so much so, that they could rely on them as on heavenly anchors. Botany, too, was originally only the science of fodder.

Now, the geometrician, astronomer, and geologist, may each pursue their researches, not looking fully or even askance at the utility of their researches, yet, after all, there is a close connection between the higher branches of science and philosophy, and the work-a-day concerns and wealth producing businesses of life. History shows that no so-called science flourishes long that does not in some way serve the interests of society. Where are the votaries of astrology, once so many? The retorts and all the apparatus of alchemy, are they not now the property of less pretentious, but immeasurably usefuller chemistry.

The science of language, unlike others with which it may come into competition, seems to have little to offer to the utilitarian spirit of the age; yet it is nearly related to some problems and departments of inquiry which are not without their interest to men. What an influence mythology has exerted on the character and literature of the world? And mythology, as Max Muller shows in another of his works, is nothing but a disease of language. In bygone days a controversy—Nominalism *versus* Realism—fiercely agitated men's minds, and this was a question about words and the relation between words and things. The claims of nations and languages as set against dynasties and treaties, have been advanced, and the time is probably coming when such claims will be more respectfully listened to. But there is another question of great interest and moment to men, if we are to gauge its presumed importance by the excited and even fierce way in which it is discussed by controversialists: What is man's true place in creation? Is he akin to the brutes; the difference between him and them being one of degree only, and not of kind? As will be seen hereafter, language may render sturdy service towards the settlement of this question.

The next stage a science enters upon is classification. Men are generally led to put forth that effort of the intellect which ends in scientific system, by the sense of utter bewilderment, arising from the presence of a crowd of things many of which are seen to be marked by differences. The mind, hitherto confused and baffled in its attempt to gain a satisfactory view of a wide field of knowledge, now avails itself of method, and strives by comparison, generalisation, and the giving of class names to be able to cast an understanding glance over that field, seeing objects according to their true stature, and in their proper places and relations.

When sciences have reached the theoretical stage an answer may be attempted to the question—Why are these things so? Drawing

near to God by the diligent and devout study of his works, men find God drawing near to them to reveal his purposes. A point of vantage is gained whence glimpses can be caught of remoter truths. Has the science of language passed through these three stages? If so, how? Has its progress been rapid, or slow; desultory, or steady?

Professor Muller is not able to turn his attention at once to these questions. He has first to define his science and to distinguish it from philology, with which it is liable to be confounded. Philology proper uses language as a means to an end; to illustrate by minute, and at times apparently trivial, criticism those words in which the thought-jewels of ancient sages and poets are enshrined, so—

"That on the stretched forefinger of all time"

they may sparkle more brightly for ever; or, it uses it to arrive at a clear and detailed knowledge of the national and social life of such states as Greece and Rome. But to the science of language itself is the end. It does not pay court to one tongue because it is polished and classical, and despise another because it is rude and unliterary. As the humble daisy is an object of curiosity and examination to the botanist equally with the oak, so to the scientific linguist the vocal modulations of Chinese, and the jargons of savages, are hardly of less importance than Homer's verse or Cicero's prose.

M. Muller is again detained from surveying the history of his science by having to do battle for it with those who would exclude it from the circle of the physical sciences; for to such a favoured circle the Professor maintains the science of language belongs, even as geology and natural history do. Hence he at once joins issue with them who, denying this, hold that it should more properly be classed with those sciences that are called historical, since they spring from the mind of man, and have, like painting and music a recognisable history and development.

He first deals with the theory that language was a human invention. "In the beginning" it is said, "men lived in a state of mutism, communicating with each other by means of gestures and facial expressions, till at last, when ideas multiplied that could no longer be pointed at with the fingers, they found it necessary to invent artificial signs, of which the meaning was fixed by mutual agreement." This view has had the sanction of great names, being endorsed by Adam Smith, Locke, and in the main by Dugald Stewart. Yet there is one fatal objection to it, not to look for more at present, that it is impossible to conceive how men should have been able, not as yet having language, to meet together in conference, to determine what language should be.

Others find in the changes language has undergone a valid reason why it should be excluded from the physical sciences. These deal with the works of God, the historical with the works of man. A certain fixedness and perfection from the commencement mark what God has wrought in nature. The divine artificer's works are not bettered by practice. The Philomel of the Greeks sang as sweetly as our nightingale. The hexagonal cells of bees are not mathematically more correct than at any previous time. The flowers of our parterres are not more lively or fragrant than those tinted by the antidiluvian sun. But flux and faultiness characterise the works of man. If ever the productions of his hand or intellect reach apparent perfection, it is only after time has admitted of a development, marked, it may be, by temporary retrogressions and stoppages. Has not something like this been the experience of language? Where can you find aught that has been subject to more mutation? Let the changes which English alone has passed through suffice as a specimen of what has distinguished language from the beginning. Could we go into some mouldering library that bears on its shelves the literature of England for the last 900 years, we would have a palpable proof of the extensive alterations that have taken place in our tongue, we could read Milton and Shakspeare easily enough; with a little trouble we might make out the black letter of Wycliffe's Testament; but Chaucer could only be deciphered with the help of a glossary, and if we wished to spell out a MS. of Alfred's time we would have to learn the English then in use, just as we would learn any other language. Nor is our tongue now stationary. It is slowly changing, though newspapers, periodicals, and especially a bible familiar to the people, have served to check the swiftness of its transitions. It is easy to see that the English of the bible is not our every day speech. The number of words or senses of words in the bible that have become obsolete since 1611 is 388, or one fifteenth part of those used in the scriptures. Smaller changes in accent and pronunciation are continually taking place. Rogers said, "cóntemplate is bad enough, but bálcony makes me sick," yet the pronunciations so distasteful to the author of the Pleasures of Memory are now in vogue. Now when it is considered that such changes have not been confined to English, but have taken place on a larger scale elsewhere, "must we not," it is asked, "write a history of language, and will it not have to be classed as an historic science?"

We must, in reply, distinguish between *historic change* and *natural growth*. Art, science, philosophy have a history, only language or other production of nature admits of growth. Though there cannot be language without man any more than there can be a tree without soil, yet the changes which occur in language cannot be produced or prevented by man. When the Emperor Tiberius

had made a mistake and was reproved for it by Marcellus, another grammarian of the name of Capito, who happened to be present, remarked that what the Emperor said was good Latin, or if it were not, it would soon be so. Marcellus, more of a grammarian than a courtier, replied, "Capito is a liar, for Cæsar thou canst give the Roman citizenship to men, but not to words."

The growth of language is produced by the operation of two principles very dissimilar, yet carried on simultaneously—*phonetic corruption* and *dialectic regeneration*. In regard to the first principle, it will have to be taken for granted at present that everything about a word had originally a meaning. Even now this is the case with Chinese. There is nothing redundant or wanting in this monosyllabic tongue. The alteration of a single letter will make a word mean something very different or nothing. But in our own tongue many words are but the relics of their former selves. They are like old coins yet in circulation, but with the image and legend effaced. The meaning attached to them seems arbitrary, not being evident from a glance at the word. The visual image of the word *husband* is not called up by its present orthography. We miss the poetry of the original compound *house-band*. We do not know unless we are told, that *shunt* is the contraction of *shun it*, *maudlin* of *Magdalene*, that *Lord* is as originally *hlaf-ord*, the *origin of bread*, or that *alert* is really three words in composition, bearing the united signification of *to the eminence*. It is almost impossible to estimate the extent to which phonetic decay has operated, and how early it must have broken out, when such languages as Greek and Latin abound in these words whose vitality has been lost, as certain fossiliferous rocks abound in once living creatures.

The other principle at work in the growth of language is dialectic regeneration. It may be the fashion in some quarters to disparage dialects, but that does not alter the fact that they are of very great importance to a right understanding of the growth of language. Language is spending a far freer and more natural life in those remote districts where a schoolmaster is yet almost as much a *rara avis* as a black swan or white crow, than it does where it has to stand on its propriety, and its true growth is hindered by dictionaries and reviews, and all the formidable array of police, provided by literature and polite society. It is a great mistake to suppose that dialects are but corruptions of the literary language; and it is absurd to believe with some that the greater number of provincialisms arose from parents adopting the nursery lispings and babblings of their children. Classical or literary languages are leading an artificial existence. If we would see language in its free state we must go to uncivilised peoples. Travellers and missionaries tell us that in those countries which have no literature or fixed

government dialects are very numerous and are continually changing. But in cases where one of such dialects has been reduced to writing, and made the medium of civilising influences, it has obtained pre-eminence and superseded the rest. So from analogy we conclude there must at first have been an almost boundless variety in human speech, but soon laws, government, oracles, public deliberations, and, finally, literature, arose to check the rankness of its growth.

Both these principles are simultaneously at work in the growth of language. Let a glance be taken at the Romance or Neo-Latin dialects, comprising Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Wallachian, ancient Provencal, and the language of the Grisons of Switzerland. In all these tongues there is a marked affinity to Latin; yet the closeness of this affinity must not be exaggerated or allowed to lead us astray. The explanation of the Romance dialects—of Italian for example, must not be sought for in Latin, but in one of the many ancient dialects of Italy. Latin itself was but one of those dialects that climbed to fame and pre-eminence. It was the dialect of the Patricians of Rome, and, finally, became the language of legislation, religion, literature, and general civilisation. But it paid for its exaltation as all such languages do, by ultimate decay. Whereas, the vulgar local dialects spoken by the middle, lower, and lowest classes of the Roman empire when Latin was in its glory, survived after the latter had fallen into desuetude as a spoken idiom, and became the stock from which the Romance dialects sprang. Political convulsions which frequently "raise up the poor out of the dust, and lift up the beggar from the dunghill to set them among princes," serve also at times to bring dialects out of their obscurity, and to instate them in a position of greater publicity and honour. To be the sources of recuperative energy to effete and artificial languages is the mission of dialects. Their resources are vast. Not a new word is wanted by the exigencies of society but it can at once be obtained from dialectic stores. The peasant or shepherd has no scanty vocabulary from which to draw when speaking of his work or his flock. Indeed he almost teems with synonyms. Somebody tells us that a Derbyshire peasant uses eight different terms for a pigsty. In his second chapter Professor Muller admits the copiousness of dialects, therefore we think it a pity that in an after part of his work (p. 277) he should countenance the idea that in some parts of England the peasant's vocabulary consists only of 300 words. It may be so. All we can say is, that our own experience, as of most who mix much with those using provincialisms, is diametrically opposed to such a limitation.

But it is necessary to bear in mind, since it establishes the justness of the claims put forth by language to be admitted amongst the natural sciences, that both of these principles, whose united

action is apparent in the growth of human speech, operate independently of man. The changes that take place in orthography and spelling on the receipt of a word from another tongue, or which ensue after the lapse of time are not the effect of accident or man's caprice, but of certain definite laws. Philologists have made themselves acquainted with these laws. Grimm discovered that every tenuis in Latin is in Gothic represented by its corresponding aspirate. This is a *law* as truly as any other that is effective in nature, therefore it has been called Grimm's law, after its discoverer. Having proved that the changes of words seemingly as wayward and incomprehensible as the eccentric notions of comets and meteors were once thought to be, are yet like them the product of uniform laws; philologists are now able to tell us what a Latin word would become, if adopted by the French, what by the Italians, &c. For each of the Romance dialects has a peculiar mould of speech in which all words that become naturalised have to be cast. They assure us that if the Latin *pater, frater, mater* be found in French it will be as *pere, frere, mere*, since a Latin *t* between two vowels is always suppressed in French.

The working of dialectic regeneration is equally beyond individual control. A poet may knowingly invent a new word, but its acceptance depends on the concurrence of numberless others. Dr. Geddes proposed to substitute the more graphic word *skipover* for *passover*. But no theologian, however broad, or however narrow, seems to have been disposed to accept the amendment. Let purists set themselves the task of improving their language; as a rule they will find their attempts bootless. Language will do its best to keep pace with thought and discovery; it cannot outstrip them. As men perceive new distinctions in thought they will distinguish them by fresh words.

Some find in the close connection subsisting between the science of language and history, a further reason why it should not be classed as a physical science. It is a partial answer to this objection that Ethnology and Zoology and other acknowledged natural sciences are also greatly indebted to historic deductions. But the objection is completely met by asserting that, if needs be, the science of Language may declare itself independent of history. Both should be mutually helpful; but they are not inseparable, like the Siamese twins. Each is, so to speak, self-sufficient and self-contained. The historian has to do with the *language of England* which has not been one and the same from the beginning, the comparative philologist with the *English language*. To the latter it matters little where a language is spoken, or by whom, whether by many or few. So long as it is spoken by one person it has a substantive existence, as was the case with Cornish, which not very many years ago became extinct by the death of an old woman,

who was the last that talked it. The comparitive philologist having laid it down as a primary canon that grammar is the essential and distinguishing element of language, and in all cases where found, is to be made the basis of classification, takes languages as he finds them, sees in them the materials of his science, and with or without history, as the case may be, draws his conclusions. To him, English as spoken by a ploughboy bespeaks its antecedents, and affinities, and is decisive in proving it to belong with Friesian and Dutch to the low German branch of the Teutonic family. The physiologist may protest and show how common the Celtic type of skull is in England; the nobleman may protest, and bid us remember his family came in with the Conqueror, and all that the nobleman says, the heraldist may swear to. But all these demurrings and averments avail nought. Though every skull were mouldered and every geneological parchment and family escutcheon calcined, the English tongue would tell its own straightforward tale as to whence it came, and to what varieties of speech it is related. Our vernacular consists of a heterogeneous collection of words. The verbal manufactures of every nation lie side by side in its dictionary. It would be difficult to classify English by sorting its words. For on counting every word in the dictionaries of Robertson and Webster, M. Thurmerell has established the fact that of the total of 43,566 words, 29,853 came from classical, 13,230 from Teutonic, and the rest from miscellaneous sources. From the evidence of the dictionary alone, then English would have to be classed with French, as one of the Romance dialects. But a second canon of the comparative Philologist *denies the possibility of a mixed language.* For though mixed in the dictionary, language cannot be mixed in grammar. All that is left of grammar in English, is the termination of the genitive and nominative plural, the degrees of comparison and a few of the moods and tenses of the verb, yet these evidently point out English as belonging to the Teutonic class of speech.

Having defined and vindicated the relations of his science, Professor Muller returns to consider the historical questions previously broached. Has the science of language passed through the Empirical, Classificatory and Theoretical stages?

Grammar is the empirical stage of language, a stage which it entered upon comparatively early. The philosophers of ancient Greece, in the course of their inquiries into the nature of human thought, perceived that certain forms of thought had certain forms of expression corresponding to them. At a later period the learned men of Alexandria and Pergamus, in editing critical editions of Homer and other classics, appropriated these philosophical terms, and added to the nomenclature of grammar. But it was Dionysius Thrax, who in the time of Pompey, published the first practical

grammar, at Rome, in order to teach Greek to the Latins. Nothing really new has been added to the framework of grammar as put together hy Dionysius. Boys at our public schools are yet taught the classic tongues according to the system laid down by that ancient professor. It ought surely to encourage men as they toil along the steep that leads to linguistic knowledge, clambering over crabbed declensions, and coming to grief at paradigms of irregular verbs, to know that all eminent Latinists and Grecians since the days of Dionysius have had to climb the very same rugged path. There was a time in Roman history when grammar, pure and simple, was the subject of general interest and of fashionable conversation. The great Cæsar himself, amongst his other exploits, invented the ablative case. Then the schoolmaster was the man whom everybody delighted to honour. And thus history places round the head of the modern pedagogue the adventitious nimbus of ancient distinctions. But grammar is the knowledge of the empirical stage of language merely. We not only want to know that in order to express the notion of an action being completed we must append *d* or *ed* to the verb. This knowledge may suffice for practical purposes, but we want to know whence it arises that the letter *d* in loved should be able to express the tragic difference between love *going on* and love *for ever over*. Now if there be a science of language it will have to answer this and similar questions. If they cannot be answered we shall have to rest content with the art of language or grammar. These questions can only be answered after an attempt has been made to classify languages.

We know not what may be the theological creed of Professor Muller, but it is gratifying to see him gracefully acknowledging the indebtedness of his science to christianity. This is seemly. The influences of christianity have penetrated farther and deeper than many are willing to allow. The "river of God" has many outlets and reaches, and numbers whose shores they lave forget the source of the streams that make them glad. Not so M. Muller. He seems pleased to admit that the real beginning of his science dates from the day of Pentecost. The polished Greeks did not care to classify languages. Why should they? Were not all tongues barbarous but their own? The Romans, who imitated the Greeks in everything, copied their contempt for foreigners. The word *humanity* with the catholic signification it now bears, was not in either of their vocabularies. But Christ's example and teachings propagated influences which soon became partially destructive to these national prejudices; nations were felt to be akin. Even in the Areopagus, at Athens, a voice was heard proclaiming that "God had made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Nor has the science of language been indebted to christianity merely for its first impulse. The pioneers

of the science have been the Apostles, and their modern representatives, the missionaries. The translations into other tongues of the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Scriptures which the latter have made are amongst the most valuable materials of the philologist.

The science of language was for a long time retarded by the idea that Hebrew must be the primitive language and parent of every other. It is almost saddening to see the laborious waste of learning that marked the attempts of scholars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to make facts square with their mistaken hypothesis. The first to rise superior to this prejudice in favour of Hebrew was the versatile and indefatigable Leibnitz. "There is," he said, "as much reason for supposing Hebrew to have been the primitive language of mankind, as there is for adopting the view of Garopius, who published a work at Antwerp in 1580, to prove that Dutch was the language spoken in Paradise."

Passing over the catalogues of languages and other colossal works given to the world by industrious men, incited to the endeavour by the impulse which Leibnitz' ardent soul had given to the study of language, we are called upon to notice an event that occurred about the commencement of the present century that ultimately wrought a revolution in the science. This was the discovery of Sanscrit, the sacred language of the Hindoos that ceased to be spoken at least three hundred years before Christ. We call this event a discovery; for though the existence of Sanscrit had been known from the time of Alexander the Great, it was not till the learned got access to Hindoo literature and were able to compare Sanscrit with other tongues, that certain truths came to light; truths startling and disagreeable to some, because flashing the suspicion on their minds that certain of their prepossessions were rickety and untenable, but truths which every real student of language joyfully hailed as the pledge of a bright future for his science. A superficial examination of Sanscrit showed that it was more perfect than Greek, and more copious than Latin. On examining it more closely, and comparing it with Latin and Greek the remarkable fact was disclosed that Sanscrit, as it was spoken long before the time of Solomon, was intimately related to those languages, standing indeed to them in the relation, not of parent, but of elder sister. For as the laws regulating phonetic decay forbade the idea that Greek and Latin could be derived from Sanscrit, or *vice-versa*, the persuasion was induced that there must have been a primitive language that formed the common background of the Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, Helenic, Indic, and Italic dialects, all of which co-ordinate varieties of speech, therefore, were banded together by Schlegel under the name of the Indo-Germanic family of speech. This title M. Muller has discarded in favour of the adjective *Argan*. The discovery of Sanscrit also

established the fact that grammatical terminations were once distinct words ground down by phonetic corruption. Thus the letter *d* in *loved*, which puts such a gulf between present and past experience, was found to be a relic of the auxiliary verb *did*, this in its turn being the cripple of a word that in its root corresponds to the Sanscrit *dadhau*, I placed. Comparative grammar has done more than this. It has shown that the progenitors of all the Aryan races must anciently have lived together somewhere in Asia, as one nation or tribe; and by comparing together a number of words current in all the Aryan tongues bearing a striking resemblance, it is possible to form some conception of the mode of life that then obtained; since these resembling words must have been spoken by that primitive tribe before its families divided and dispersed to seek their several fortunes. "Before their separation the Aryans led the life of agricultural nomads—a life such as Tacitus describes that of the ancient Germans. They knew the arts of ploughing, of making roads, of building ships, of weaving, and sewing, of erecting houses; they had counted at least as far as one hundred. They had domesticated the most important animals; the cow, the horse, the sheep, the dog; they were acquainted with the most useful metals, and armed with iron hatchets, whether for peaceful or warlike purposes; they had recognised the bonds of blood and the bonds of marriage; they followed their leaders and kings, and the distinction between right and wrong was fixed by laws and customs; they were impressed with the idea of a Divine Being, and they invoked it by various names."

All that remains of language after grammatical terminations have been traced back to independent words, are roots—predicative and demonstrative. A root is the material element of language —that which cannot be shown to be a derivative of anything. Predicative roots are so called because they predicate the same conception of all their derivatives. Others are named demonstrative, because they point out where, or of what, such a conception is to be predicated. Professor Muller shows, at great length, how a root has built up language. There is, in Sanscrit, he tells us, a root, *pas* or *spas*, meaning *to see*, which we find in Greek as *skep*, and in Latin as *spec*. From the Greek form we have *sceptic*, *espiscopal*, and its cognates. From the Latin we have a host of derivatives, *respectable*, *respite*, *despise*, *despite*, *suspect*, *circumspect*, *haruspex*, *auspicious*, *speculate*, *species*, *special*, *specimen*, *specious*, *spices*, *spectacles*, and many others. Through a Teutonic medium we have *spy*. It might require a little thought and ingenuity to detect the concept of the etymon *spas* as present in its derivative *spices*; yet it is there. Out of a few such roots as these all language has been evolved. Consider the variety of ideas

expressed by the one root *spas*, and we shall see with 500 such roots, there is not likely to be a word-famine in the history of the world, however great the demand for words may be. Supposing each root produced 50 derivatives, we should have 25,000 words! Now how many does the reader suppose he uses habitually? It might, perhaps, surprise us to learn with how few coins we transact life's business. M. Muller tells us that a person who has received an university education, reads his *Times*, and all the books of Mudie's library, seldom uses more than three or four thousand words in actual conversation. Shakspeare, who, as we read his plays, seems to revel in words, and who displays a greater variety of expression than probably any man in any language, uses about 15,000 words. 8,000 have sufficed for Milton. Yet extensive though the ramifications of predicative roots have been, a few roots of another kind were required for the purpose of verbal composition, in order to express such ideas as *here*, *there*, *he*, *who*. Hence, in all languages we find a few pronominal, or demonstrative roots, which simply point out the subject of which the quality, or action, is predicated. Most of the terminations of declension and conjugation, are demonstrative roots; the *s*, for instance, of the third person singular, *he lives*, can be proved to have been originally the demonstrative pronoun of the third person.

After geneological classification has established the existence of a Semitic family of speech in the same way as it did the Aryan, it fails the philologist. He then has recourse to the *Morphological* system of classification, by which all languages are arranged according to their resemblance in form. For as all roots are either predicative or demonstrative, there are only three varieties of combination it is possible for these roots to assume in the languages of the earth. 1st. *Both roots may retain their independence and palpable significance.* This is the radical and natural stage of language. Ancient Chinese, with its dialects, belongs to this class. In Chinese every word is a root, and every root a word. The same root may be verb, adjective, noun, according to its collocation in the sentence. 2nd. *One root may remain intact, while the other has lost its consciousness, although it is still felt as distinct from, and modificatory of, the palpable root.* This is the terminational stage, and by far the greater number of languages are in it. The tongues comprehended in this class, or group, are called Turanian, and are spoken from Madagascar to Easter Island, a region extending over 208 degrees of latitude, also in vast tracts of Asia, chiefly by nomadic races, and by the Turks, and other peoples of Europe. In the Turanian dialects, the two roots forming a word have not become so welded together, that no joining or interstice is perceivable, but the root is felt as distinct from its termination, although the lattter has not, in every case,

retained its significance as an independent word. Language in the mouth of a Turanian, is the result of repeated acts of synthesis and analysis. By the former process pronouns are appended to verbs to express conjugation, and prepositions affixed to nouns to form declension; and then by analysis these are taken to pieces, in order to be put together again in a different way; the root remaining inviolate throughout. This peculiarity of the Turanian dialects is called agglutination. 3rd. *Both roots may have lost their independence and individuality, and have coalesced.* This, the inflexional and last stage of language, is the one the Aryan and Semetic families of speech are in.

All the languages of mankind being now practically classified, Professor Muller feels bound to turn his attention to the vexed question of the origin of language. This problem may be stated thus:—Can we reconcile with these three distinct forms language assumes—the radical, terminational, and inflectional—a belief in the common origin of human speech? Max Muller answers distinctly, "Yes!" and declares while the orthodox listen complacently and nod approval, "that they who wish to assert that language had various beginnings must prove it impossible that language could have had a common origin," a thing they have not yet been able to do. The origin of language is not matter of history; but when we do not know exactly how a thing took place, it is well to show how it may have taken place; to frame an hypothesis which shall include and tally with all the facts known. Suppose we wished to account for any peculiarity in the animal world; as for instance, for flying, which is the differentia of birds. The way to proceed would be to compare their structure with that of other animals and ascertain under what conditions flying is possible. Now language, as the outward manifestation of a mental power seems to be the differentia of man. It would be difficult to fix upon anything as the peculiar property of man, which somebody has not claimed for the lower animals. Is it will you rate man's prerogative? Max Muller says, a restive horse has got a will, as his rider knows full well. Do you hold intellect to be a light which never illumines the "spirit of the beast that goeth downward?" Max Muller believes (and he is not alone) that instinct fails to explain all the doings of animals, but that reason is mixed up with their instincts, just as instincts are mixed up with man's reason. Is immortality that which you deem the glorious and distinctive heritage of man? There have been some, and some not to be numbered amongst the simpletons of the earth, who have maintained we should find the inferior creatures our co-partners in a future life. But however men may differ in their estimate of the powers and destinies of brutes, it will be granted that language as the outcome of some mental power, is the Rubicon, which, as yet they

have not been able to cross. A parrot is able to articulate every letter of the alphabet. The reason, therefore, it has not a language must be found in some mental difference between it and man. What is this inward faculty whose outward development and sign is language, as distinguished from the cries and shrieks of birds and beasts?

Mental philosophers have approached this problem from another point, and have attempted a solution. The psychologist busies himself with the inner works and movements of microcosmic man; the philologist with the chimings of his mind in speech. If both interpret rightly, there should be no discrepancy. In regard to the case in point, are the conclusions of mental philosophers found to agree with those of philologists, such as M. Muller? Locke in his "Essay on the Human Understanding," gives it as his opinion that "the power of abstracting is not at all in brutes, and that the having of general ideas is that which puts a perfect distinction betwixt man and them, and is an excellency which the faculties of brutes do by no means attain to." Now if Locke be right and if M. Muller be right, language will be that which outwardly answers to this mental power of abstracting.

We previously learned that the primary elements of all language were predicative and denominative roots. Two theories accounting for the origin of these roots stand in the way of M. Muller's own conclusion respecting them. These theories he playfully, or as some will think contemptuously, calls the one the *bow-wow*, the other the *pooh-pooh* theory. The former has been dignified by its advocates with the title of the onomato-poetic theory, and it holds that roots were imitations of sounds; the latter holds that roots were involuntary interjections. As to the former theory, it is enough to say that there are only few words comparatively in any tongue that are imitations of words. The number of such terms is even smaller than might be supposed. For the ear of a person who may have no bias towards onomatopæia is apt to be deceived, at times, by fancied resemblances between certain words and sounds, which words, when traced back to their roots, are seen to have no connection at all with those sounds. No doubt *thunder* has often been thought to be a word mimicking uproar; yet it is taken from a root signifying to *extend*, which root has entered into the comparitive of the words *thin*, *tender*, and *tone*. The second theory is open to the same remark, only few words have been elaborated from interjections. Language, as Horne Tooke says, "has been erected on the downfall of interjections." It is only when men are reduced to a state of nature, or when language is forgotten that interjections are indulged in. In opposition to both these theories M. Muller holds that roots were significative of general terms. Now it is an old controversy amongst philosophers whether

proper terms or general appelatives were the first to be constructed. Adam Smith advocates the former view, Leibnitz the latter; while Muller mediates between them. Adam Smith is no doubt right in saying that after men had acquired such a word as *cave*, they would give that name to other things which they saw resembled the place where they had been wont to shelter themselves from the elements. But Leibnitz is also right in holding out that the formation of general terms preceded the assignment of particulars. We find that the Latin for cave is *antrum*, and the root of that word signifies in Sanscrit *within*; or before a particular cave could be called *antrum*, the general idea of inwardness must have been acquired. Analyze any word and you will find it expresses a general idea. Thus the moon is the measurer; the sun the *begetter*; the earth the *ploughed*; animal is from a word signifying the soul, and *anima* itself means breath; man signifies to think.

But how did roots originate? "The four or five hundred roots that remain as the constituent elements of language were phonetic types produced by a power inherent in the human mind." These words are rather vague, necessarily so, perhaps, considering the question with which they deal; yet we think M. Muller would repudiate the gloss put upon them by one of his critics. "It was," says the latter, "an old notion that language was conventional; but it is more consistent with probability to suppose that language is a growth of the human race, that it sprang out of its organisation and brain just as the hair of the European and the wool of the Negro sprang out of their respective scalps; and that not only the languages of men, but the imperfect dialects of the inferior animals sprang out of their organisation, perfect and imperfect, in exact proportion to the physical organisation itself." Certainly man in common with the animals must just speak, as "'Tis his nature to;" but it seems to us that the opinion just enunciated on the origin of language might consist with the extreme view of modern Anthropologists. We are very greatly mistaken if Professor Muller would not stoutly resist any attempt to make his science a mere branch of one that deals with the physical qualities of the race. Those given to examining the physical, more especially the craniological structure of man, may believe, the superiority of that structure accounts for the fact that there are not lexicographers, and orators, and poet laureates among the animals. But the philologist will hold that were it possible to give beasts or birds organs capable of sounding the whole gamut of human utterances, unless they could at the same time give them certain mental powers, they would after all remain mere talking automata or parotters of speech. Language is not merely the mimicry of sound, the symbol of feeling, it is also the expression of thought. It was the outbirth of an instinct that led man to

give articulate expression to the conceptions that thrilled through his mind. At first these phonetic types, indefinitely modifiable, must have been almost boundless. But in the course of time they would be thinned by the process of natural selection. This language-producing instinct has been lost, for man loses his instincts as he ceases to want them. Yet those roots that survived the struggle for existence have amply sufficed, and will suffice, for the wants of the human race. No new material element has been introduced into language since the beginning of the world's history. Thus the history of the changes that have taken place in language is but the history of its development or growth.

One word as to the literary character of M. Muller's work. At the commencement of the oral delivery of these lectures, M. Muller hinted that his imperfect acquaintance with their language would require forbearance from an English audience. Whether our tongue receives injustice at the *mouth* of the Professor we have not been informed; it certainly receives little from his *pen*. Many men of considerable literary eminence display a less complete mastery of English than he. But there is one fault in the book that detracts somewhat from its interestingness. In some parts the author is in danger of causing his readers' interest in his subject to flag by tediousness. Yet this very fault is the result of the Professor's erudition and generosity. Having a principle to establish or doubt to remove, he draws from the vast stores of his learning fact after fact, which he pours upon the mind of his reader until the latter almost loses sight of the point to be proved, or the doubt to be resolved, and cries "hold! enough!" But those who read for profit rather than pleasure will not let this occasional prolixity prevent their taking an early and careful reading of a work crowded with information.

BICKERSTAFF.

ART. VII.—MARY, THE MOTHER OF GOD.

AT the present day Popery is making the most strenuous efforts to recover the position she lost at the Reformation in this country. No means likely to promote her interests are neglected by her. She is audacious, violent, or smooth-tongued, as may best suit her purpose. Now she resorts to terrorism, now to suavity. In the immediate neighbourhood of the writer her priests will urge their *flock* to call in the aid of the policeman forceably to eject the city missionary who may, unassumingly, happen to cross their threshhold in his mission of mercy. In an adjoining locality, when an appearance of candour or charity is judged likely favourably to impress dissentients from the dogmas of Rome, they are addressed within the walls of a Popish chapel as dear dissenting brethren. These are small local illustrations of the multifarious aspects of Popery. As the spreading flood fills every crevice within its extension and up to its level, so Popery, diffusive and insinuating, steadily pours her malign influence into every opening which will give her a position whence she can advance her ends. Vigilance and indefatigable perseverance are commendable qualities considered *per se*, or in connection with virtuous objects, but we do not regard them with admiration when allied to detestable error. We would commend the zeal of Popery were it tributary to truth, but it is not; on the contrary, it is evoked in favour of "damnable heresies," having destruction in their wake. Mariolatry is one of the grand errors of the Romish Church. It is the centre of many others, that with which they stand or fall. Hence the devotion of the *educated* papist to the virgin mother, the boldness with which he will defend this idolatry. All error is more or less related to truth. The relation is like that of divergent lines to their starting point; like that of the strayed sheep to the forsaken fold. But for the angle we could not affirm the lines divergent; but for the fold we could not describe the sheep as strayed. The ultimate extension of the divergent lines may be incalculably distant, and the strayed sheep may be so far off as to be irretrievably lost; but distance does not destroy connection. Is there any principle in human nature, any principle of truth from which this huge error may have started? Is it the echo of our sympathy? Are there superior excellencies in womankind which the sterner sex regard as the complement of our nature, without which heaven itself would be defective? It may be so. It may be that this error is but the exaggeration of these sympathies. As somewhat illustrative of this

idea we quote the following suggestive remarks without committing ourselves to their orthodoxy: "It is remarkable that Christ is never said to have called a woman to follow him as he called the disciples; and quite as remarkable that, so far as the evidence goes, no woman ever spoke a word against him, while many women were last at the cross, and earliest at the sepulchre. It seems as though he had assumed that the womanly side of human nature would not require any calling, that the heart of woman would instinctively welcome him as the solution of all difficulties, the sum of all charms, the sovereign of frail and needy creatures, who have immense capacity for suffering, but little satisfaction in the results of mere logic. Christ was emphatically, uniquely, the seed of the woman. What woman could reject her own son? Does not every woman look with intensely hopeful love upon the son of her womb? He will be her comfort, her song, her saviour; she no longer lives but in him and for him. Through him she interprets the future, and for his sake takes a kinder view of all mankind. Christ was born to every woman. Men required to be called, women only to be attracted. Women had but to see him in order to claim him as the fairest among ten thousand and the altogether lovely, to recognise him as the tenderest and wisest friend of womanhood. They needed no call. The dew waits for no voice to call it to the sun. Few women ever go to Christ through the medium of mere doctrine. They live beyond the cold propositional region. The dew finds its way up to the sun without knowing anything of the laws of motion, or the mysteries of light; and womanly hearts go up to Christ, often knowing little of objective theology, yet wise because inspired and guided by the love which is the elect interpreter of God. God is love, and by her superior capacity of love, woman is so much nearer God than man can ever be. It is hardly to be wondered at, that millions of Christians, even now, feel that heaven itself requires the distinctive presence of the womanly element, and express the feeling by addressing Mary as mother of God. If Protestantism were less technical and more human, it would hesitate before condemning the feeling which dictates this startling appellation. The fact may be that God is more human than traditional doctrinism has yet dared to conceive. We think of humanity too exclusively by the flesh. It is to be remembered that the body is the lesser portion of man, and that we speak rightly of the human *mind* as well as the human body. It is on the mind side that we approach God, through the mind side that we communicate with God, and on the mind side that we resemble God. In this sense God is more human, or man more divine, than has yet been authenticated by the councils of Christendom. God is not declared to be power, but he is declared to be love; whosoever, therefore, can love most is most like God. It is

not to the point to argue that men excel women in pure intellectual force; even allowing as a conceit what we cannot concede as a fact, it amounts to nothing in this case. A lion is stronger, an eagle swifter than man, yet it is not to be inferred that they are nearer God than man is; but God is love, and nearest to him in soul-quality is a question of love. Nor is it to the point that women have fallen into greater depths of sin; the greater the depth the greater the nature. If God himself could sin all other sinners would be forgotten in the darkness of the stupendous apostacy."* These words are not apologetic of Mariolatry, nor are they quoted merely because of the beautifully expressed sentiment they contain, but to show that there is a point in human nature whence this divergent line may have proceeded. But if we are so constituted that we love superior excellence and all that is lovable in humanity, this fact by no means justifies the idolatry into which a large portion of Christendom has fallen. To vindicate the worship they pay to Mary, papists claim for her relationship to God, which is revolting to reason and destructive of true religion. We turn our attention to this dogma for two reasons; first, because the divine maternity of Mary is syllogistically maintained by popish agents, and plausibly urged upon the unwary; and secondly, because a young friend has requested us to examine the syllogism by which they endeavour to maintain this dogma, to point out its fallacy, and logically and scripturally to refute the conclusion it affirms. The following observations were written for the private perusal of this individual, and two things were aimed at. The first was a logical exercise for the young friend in question, and the second to expose, as he desired, the absurd character of this popish doctrine. This accounts for the logical phraseology which occurs in this paper, and which gives it a rather pedantic air. The syllogism is as follows:—

Mary was the mother of Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ was God, ergo, Mary was the mother of God.

We would remark that in a proper syllogism there are three terms only, two of which are called the extremes, or the major and minor terms; the other is called the middle term. But in the above syllogism there are five terms, namely,—1st, Mary; 2nd, Mother of Jesus Christ; 3rd, Jesus Christ; 4th, God; and 5th, Mother of God. This extravagance of terms produces what is called, a fallacy of ambiguity.

We would remark in the next place that the major term is the predicate of the conclusion, and the minor the subject of the conclusion. The conclusion, of course, is the third proposition of a *regularly* constructed syllogism, and is formed from the two pre-

* Ecce Deus, pp. 86-88.

ceding propositions, called premises, or respectively the major and minor premiss. It will, therefore, at once appear that the major term here is, Mother of God; and the minor term, Mary.

Again, the middle term, so called because in point of comprehensiveness it is usually midway between the two extremes, in a regularly constructed syllogism is that with which the major term is compared in the major premiss, and the minor term in the minor premiss. Now in this example the major term, Mother of God, does not occur in either of the premises, and hence it has not been compared, and consequently, were every word in the syllogism perfectly true, still nothing is proved; for if the major be not predicated of a middle term, which has also been predicated of the minor, how can we predicate the major of the minor? The premised propositions, in such a case, are beyond the province of logic, and stand as independent propositions, admitting of no inference being adduced from them. It is a canon in logic that in a perfect syllogism "the argument must be so expressed that the major term of the conclusion shall be predicated of its minor, in consequence of that minor being contained in a distributed middle of which the same major is predicated." In the syllogism we are examining this rule is altogether ignored. Not only is there no comparison of the extremes with the middle term, but there is no distribution of a middle. It is a syllogism in Barbara; every proposition is both universal and affirmative. In every such proposition the subject is distributed. Jesus Christ is the subject of the minor premiss, and so far meets the requirement of distribution, but unfortunately the extremes are not compared with it. No principle of subordination is at all recognised. The conclusion is therefore invalid. The illogical character of the syllogism will perhaps be better perceived were we to substitute numeral signs for the terms, as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, using 1 for Mary, 2 for Mother of Jesus Christ, 3 for Jesus Christ, 4 for God, and 5 for Mother of God. The syllogism would then stand thus—

1 is 2
3 is 4 therefore
1 is 5

Here we affirm 2 of 1 and 4 of 3, and conclude by affirming 5 of 1, although we have previously made no affirmation of the kind. It must appear evident that there is no connecting link between the premises and the conclusion of any such syllogism.

Furthermore, as Mother of God is the major, and Mary the minor, term, which of the other terms are we to regard as the middle term? As we have previously observed, the middle term is that with which the extremes are compared. The minor, Mary, is the only one of the extremes which is compared, and Mother of

Jesus Christ is the term with which it is compared. But as the major is not compared with this term, it is just as absurd to call this the middle term as it would be to describe a man, in a domestic brawl, as the mediator between himself and his wife. Wherever there is a middle thing there must of necessity be two other things between which it stands, to justify your description of it as a middle thing. But none of the terms in this syllogism occupy this position; we therefore have no proper middle term, and hence the conclusion is not a legitimate inference from the preceding propositions. We grant that to a papist, holding each separate proposition as true, the syllogism by no means appears in the illogical, or rather ridiculous, light in which we have put it. It is something like the following:—Mary Queen of Scots was mother of James VI. of Scotland; James VI. of Scotland was James I. of England, ergo, Mary Queen of Scots was mother of James I. of England. Every proposition here we hold to be true; but there is nothing legitimately proved by them after all. If the terms were expressed numerically, as in the previous example, the arrangement would be identical, and the conclusion of no greater value. Syllogisms may be constructed in this way to bring out any result one likes, a conclusion true in itself, or otherwise, but not deducible from the premises. On the other hand, a conclusion may be logically true when in other respects it is false, that is to say, true, granting the premises to be true; but if the premises themselves contain a fallacy, then the conclusion is worthless. Now it appears to us in the syllogism under consideration there is a fallacy in the premises as well as an absence of logical sequence in the conclusion. It is a fallacy to assume that the terms Jesus Christ and God are equivalents. We do most firmly and truly believe that Jesus Christ was and is God, while at the same time we do not regard these terms as identical.

The Romanist would not dispute that it was only the second person in the trinity who became incarnate, and that consequently incarnation cannot be affirmed of the Father or of the Holy Spirit. If the term God be taken as equivalent to Godhead, and consequently to the blessed Trinity, it is more extensive than the term Jesus Christ, and hence in this sense these two terms do not coincide. But as each person in the blessed Trinity is possessed equally of all the essential attributes of deity, each is said to be God; and as the divine nature of our Lord was the second person in the Trinity, we say, that Jesus Christ was God, meaning thereby that in the person of Jesus Christ existed the divine nature, that is to say, that it existed in personal connection with the man Christ Jesus. This is what divines call the hypostatical union. Now just as the term God is more extensive when applied to the Trinity, to the three divine persons, than when applied to Jesus Christ,

who is one person, so also the term Jesus Christ is more comprehensive than the term God in its personal connection with our Redeemer, for Jesus Christ indicates the God-man, which is a more comprehensive term than the term God. It is however true that it is used sometimes in relation to his humanity only, as for example, "the man Christ Jesus," "Jesus Christ a man approved of God." In such texts the term is used with limitation. This point perfectly understood, will assist us to perceive the ambiguity of the syllogism. The terms, Mother of Jesus Christ, and Mother of God, and Jesus Christ and God, are paronymous expressions, but are assumed to be synonymous, hence the argument is sophistical. If it be maintained that Jesus Christ and God are equivalent terms, then it would have to be proved either that the divine nature was transmuted into the human nature of Jesus Christ, or that his human nature was transmuted into the divine. In either case the divine incarnation ceases to be the *union* of two natures in one *person*. It becomes the amalgamation of two natures into a third and distinct nature, of which we know nothing, and have never heard. If the term, Jesus Christ, is used with reference to the human nature of our Lord only, it is quite intelligible; and it is consistent to say, Mary the Mother of Jesus Christ; but it is altogether a different thing to say, Mary, the Mother of God. We are convinced it cannot be rationally, or scripturally, affirmed that Mary was the Mother of both natures. What do we understand by the term Mother? A female parent who originates, or produces, another. It seems out of character, outrageous, to attempt to disprove that the divine nature originated with Mary. Were this the case, then God is no longer God, and Mary no longer a woman. But if all that is meant by the proposition, Mary was the Mother of God, be that Mary gave birth to that person who was the God-man, and in whom the human and divine were hypostatically united before as yet the child Jesus was born, there may be nothing to object. Still we should strongly demur to the propriety of the language. For God was not then originated, and the divine nature could not have such relation to Mary as had his humanity, and consequently, she could not truly and properly, even after this admission, be said to be the Mother of God.

We are aware that Romanists believe in the divine and human natures of our Lord; but this Popish argument ignores the dualistic nature of Jesus Christ. It seems to imply that in Jesus Christ the human and divine were fused into one nature to make one person. But this is opposed both to reason and Scripture. If such a notion were syllogised, it would assume some such a form as the following: As the human and divine natures in Christ were amalgamated, whoever was the mother of the one was the mother of the other; but Mary was that Mother, therefore Mary was the

Mother of both. No intelligent Papist would maintain the whole of the major proposition. Were one to do so, it would be proper to call upon him to shew what was the result of this fusion of natures. If, in this transmutative sense, the divine became human, then there was no God to be born, none to whom Mary could be Mother; or, if man became God, then the man Christ Jesus never was born, whence it would follow that Jesus Christ was man and not God, or God and not man; but if both natures were lost, the one in the other, then we have another nature altogether. Thus the argument would lead us into a species of profanity. If the divine and human natures remained distinct, although hypostatically united, in the person of Jesus Christ, then the absurdity of a fusion of natures, which some, although few, maintain, is disposed of, and the fact of Mary's being the Mother, *i.e.*, the producer of the human nature of Jesus Christ, can easily be conceived without connecting therewith the contradictory proposition that she was the Mother, that is, the producer of an uncreated and eternal nature. To any unprejudiced mind, the absurdity of the syllogism will appear with the force of intuitive evidence, were we to paraphrase it thus:—Mary was the mother of the created human nature of Jesus Christ, who, as such, was man; but Jesus Christ, as the possessor of a higher, an uncreated, eternal, divine nature, was God; therefore, Mary, although brought into existence only a few years before the birth of the man Christ Jesus, was notwithstanding the mother, *i.e.*, the producer of the uncreated eternal God. Thus we have endeavoured to show that the argument is fallacious, and contains irrational principles. We are certain it cannot be successfully affirmed that the Scriptures countenance this absurd and blasphemous doctrine. This we shall endeavour to ascertain. But in passing, we would guard the reader against a common but false accusation, brought against Protestants by Papists, namely, that they despise the Virgin, and dishonour her memory. Because we do not choose to fall in with their idolatry, to worship their idol; and, moreover, because we place Mary upon a level, in relation to God, with any other subject of grace, therefore we are represented as despising and dishonouring this most blessed among women. But his good sense will at once tell him that, not to worship a creature is one thing, and to dishonour that creature quite another; and that the one by no means involves the other. So far from despising the virgin mother we honour her as one most highly honoured of God. It has pleased the Almighty to employ on divers occasions unfallen angels to minister his will to the heirs of a blissful immortality; but divine Providence never allotted to any of them a part so honourable, in reference to human salvation, as he has to this illustrious woman, a part which, while it uni-

versally affects mankind, has a double bearing upon the sisterhood of our species. If it was the shame of woman that she was at first the instrument of the ruin of our race, surely that shame is now effaced by the fact of the selection of her as the instrument of human redemption. Surely she must be highly honoured who is constituted a subject of divine grace, the medium of the mission of the Saviour into our world, and the occasion thus of life everlasting to innumerable myriads of saved sinners. To hold her in this esteem is highly to honour her; but to regard her as the mother of God is to put her into a false position, and there is no honour where truth is wanting. If the Scriptures affirmed in absolute terms that Mary was the mother of God, there would be an end of all controversy on the subject among those who bow to their authority; but this is not the case. They teach no such doctrine. No text of Scripture is adduced in support of it. It is merely an inference, the inconsequential character of which has been demonstrated a thousand times.

We have in the gospel narratives incidental references to undue respect shewn to the mother of Jesus; but the same narratives shew how Jesus checked and reproved every such expression of feeling. Luke informs us that a certain woman, who had been listening to his discourse, exclaimed, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked." It does not appear that this woman had any personal acquaintance with Mary, or any undue regard for her. She was herself probably a mother, and astonished at the teaching of Jesus, she expressed her feelings by exclaiming in effect, What a blessed mother to have such a son. It was natural for her to think that the happiness of the woman who was the mother of such a son must be great indeed. How did Jesus reply to this observation? "Yea, rather, blessed are those that hear the word of God and keep it." Thus he taught those listening to him, and thereby us, that the circumstance of hearing and obeying the word of God is a greater blessedness than that of being his mother. That Mary was greatly honoured of God by being the mother of the human nature, or existence, of our Lord was not denied by him; but he taught that it was a still greater honour, a greater blessedness to be spiritually related to him. It is quite in accordance with the frailty of human nature to claim superiority over others on the ground of a carnal relation to Jesus. But in the most emphatic manner he refused to acknowledge the validity of any such claim, nor would he allow those who were his relations according to the flesh in any way to interfere with his public ministry. It is recorded by Matthew (xii. 46-50) that on one occasion when engaged in teaching the people "his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak to him. Then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without

desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples and said, Behold my mother and my brethren, For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother." Can any one reasonably doubt, after duly considering these words, that our blessed Lord attaches far more importance to a spiritual relationship to himself than to a carnal one? Upon this point he maintained a striking consistency from first to last. "At the marriage feast, which immediately preceded his public ministry, he checked her (Mary's) interference, even with some severity, when she intimated her expectation that he would work a public miracle for the accommodation of the company; though he immediately afterwards performed the same privately, for the conviction, as it appears, of his disciples. (John ii. 1, 11). In the progress of his ministry he publicly disclaimed her right of concerning herself with his conduct, even for his personal welfare, demanding 'Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? Who are the persons urging under these titles claims to my attention, while I am engaged in proclaiming the doctrine of salvation?' (Matt. xii, 48, 50). And in the concluding scene of suffering we may well believe that, when he again addressed his mother with the appellation "woman," and directed his beloved disciple to behold in her his mother, (John xix. 26, 27) his intention was to abdicate for ever the human relationship of his earthly parent, as terminated with his earthly existence, that she might not, by superstitious worship, be exalted, as she has been, to the throne of heaven." *

All this perfectly agrees with the whole system of truth taught by our Lord, and with the grand object of his divine mission. A carnal dispensation preceded his coming into our world. The carnal ordinances of that dispensation he abrogated, and placed in their stead spiritual principles. The kingdom he came to establish was not of this world, it was spiritual, and had its seat in the human heart. He proposed to gather a spiritual community around the throne of his Father, redeemed from among men, among whom all the ties of carnal relationship should be dissolved, all earthly affinity obsolete, among whom the terms, father, mother, brother, sister, should be irrelevant; in a word, a community whose translated state should be so far above what is earthly that they should sustain an equality with angelic natures, (Luke xx. 35, 36). Why then should he attempt to perpetuate the earthly ties which existed between himself, his mother, and her children, when such ties should be for ever dissolved in that spiritual brotherhood of whom he is architype.

* The Rev. Thomas H. Horne on Mariolatry.

Such relationships are incongruous in heaven. In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female: true as to privilege on earth, true with absolute literality in heaven.

If any religious importance were intended to be attached to the maternity of Mary, it is inexplicable that the Apostles John, Peter, James, Jude, Paul, should be perfectly silent on the subject. Singular that Jesus himself should never hint at it. So far as the evidence of the inspired record goes he never even addressed her in the endearing words *my mother*. This reticence is significant. Had Mary been the mother of God these writers could not thus have been oblivious of her position and claims; nor could Jesus, ever dutiful and affectionate as a Son, and faithful as a revealer of the purposes of heaven, have treated her with the apparent coldness described by the evangelists, had it been the design of heaven that she should be regarded with religious emotion, or served with religious honours of any kind.

The grand object to be gained by establishing this popish dogma is to raise Mary to the dignity of queen of heaven, to secure for her honours corresponding with those claimed by heaven's king, and thus to establish the whole system of saint worship, and so justify the idolatrous worship of the Church of Rome. The worship of Mary is the keystone of the entire structure. We are aware that papists, when pressed upon this subject, feel exceedingly annoyed, and endeavour to defend themselves by distributing worship into different kinds or degrees, expressed by appropriate terms. Thus they have Latria to indicate that worship which belongs to God. Dulia, that inferior sort of worship which belongs to angels and saints; and Hyperdulia, that superior worship due to the Virgin Mary. Ferraris, an authority in the Romish church, says, "Of sacred or religious adoration there are three kinds, namely, *Latria*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Dulia*. The adoration or worship of Latria is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of his uncreated supremacy and infinite excellency. The adoration or worship of Hyperdulia is that which is due and rendered to the blessed Virgin on account of the maternity of God, and other excellent gifts, and her special supereminent sanctity beyond others. The adoration or worship of Dulia is that which is due and given to the saints on account of the supernatural excellence of their sanctity and glory." But what avails these nice distinctions? Can the common people, unacquainted with the Greek language, appreciate the difference of these words; and is it not natural, that when urged incessantly to worship the Virgin, they should pass, in the ardour of their devotion, from Hyperdulia to Latria? But, in point of fact, this distinction is not maintained in practice by the Romish church, for "there are many instances in which Latria, or supreme worship, is rendered to

saints or divided between them and the Almighty," as may at any time be seen by looking into their books of devotion. Take the following examples:—"We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God: despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin." Hail! holy Queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope! to thee we cry, poor, banished sons of Eve, to thee we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears; turn then, most gracious advocate, thy eyes of mercy towards us, and, after this our exile is ended, shew unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus; O clement! O pious! O sweet Virgin Mary." "O Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, dearest mother of God, Queen of Angels, advocate of sinners, comforter of the afflicted, extend, O glorious Virgin, the ear of your pity to the prayers of me, your most humble servant, and grant me by your grace to be of the number of those whom you love and keep inscribed in your virginal bosom. Purify my heart, O immaculate Virgin! from every sin; take away and banish from me all, everything that can offend your chaste eyes; purge this soul of its affection for earthly and sinful goods, and raise it to the love of celestial and everlasting blessings, and cause that this may be my whole study and diligence; pray to your Son, O holy Virgin! for me now, always, and at the hour of death, and in that tremendous and awful day of judgment, and when I shall be obliged to render an account of my actions, that by your means I may be able to escape the eternal flames." Any one who will consider these specimens of Romish devotion will be convinced that the distinction of degrees of devotion is practically set aside by them, and that the apology they make in defence of this custom is inapplicable, namely, "that they only pray to saints to pray for them."

The distinction made by Romanists between these words is not in accordance with the usage of the New Testament writers DOULEUO and LATREUO, the verbs whence the words in question are derived, occur in the New Testament, the former twenty-five times, the latter twenty-one times, and are used indifferently, to express divine worship. Moreover, as the generic idea is service, these words are used to indicate religious, idolatrous, or civil service, as the case may be; the connection always shewing the kind of service intended. In confirmation of this remark, we refer to the following texts: DOULEUO in the following texts is used:—

1. Indifferently, Mat. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13.
2. In a civil sense, Luke xv. 29; John viii. 33; Acts vii. 7; Rom. ix. 12.
3. To indicate christian courtesy, Gal. v. 13.
4. As expressive of sinful affections, Tit. iii. 3.
5. To express the highest religious duties, Acts xx. 9; Rom. vii. 6, 25; xii. 11; xiv. 18; 1 Thess. i. 9.

LATREUO, in the following texts is used:—

1. To indicate idolatrous service, Acts vii. 42; Rom. i. 25.

2. To express a ritual service, Heb. viii. 5; xiii. 10.

3rd. To denote the highest worship, Matt. iv. 10. These texts shew that the Romish distinction of degrees of worship is not countenanced by the use of these words in the New Testament. The fact is, so far from countenancing this double dealing in the matter of religious worship, the Scriptures condemn it *in toto*, and utter the most tremendous curses upon those who are guilty of it. —See Rev. xiv. 9-11. Thus we see that the Scriptures discountenance a divided worship, and all approach to religious veneration of the Virgin, and so also do they pass by in silence the maternity of God. The true relation of Mary to Jesus is distinctly given by Paul.—Rom. i. 3. His words are "Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh." Mary, like her espoused, was of the house and lineage of David. It was according to the flesh that Jesus had a filial relation to David, and of course only according to the flesh that Mary had a maternal relation to Jesus. David sustained a paternal relation to Jesus, as did Mary, and if Mary was the mother of God, so also David was the father of God.

The pharisees were asked by our Lord what think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?

They replied, "The son of David." "But," said Jesus in return, "How then doth David, in spirit, call him Lord? If David then call him Lord, how is he then his son?" We are told that no man was able to answer him a word. That David could be the father of God was a blasphemy which never entered the mind of the Pharisees. It has been reserved to the sons of an apostate church to assign an earthly patronage to David's Lord, and upon the heads of these degenerate children we read in legible characters the awful word BLASPHEMY.

J. M.

BRIEF NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Filey and its Fishermen. By GEORGE SHAW. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., Paternoster Row; W. Lister, Sutton Street.

BOOKS of this kind have a peculiar charm for hours of quiet relaxation. Sketchy, chatty, anecdotal, they instruct without weariness, they amuse without dissipation. Passing rapidly from "grave to gay, from lively to severe," they produce a happy flux of thought and feeling, and store the mind with pleasant and profitable remembrances. The book before us is one of the best we have yet seen. It consists of two parts. The first part is devoted chiefly to descriptions of the town of Filey and the adjacent sea coast, interspersed with many curious facts in natural history, and deeply affecting incidents of personal bravery, hair-breadth escapes, and overwhelming disasters. The second part deals more exclusively with the inhabitants of Filey, dwelling at length on their religious characteristics and professional habits. A most interesting account is furnished of the mighty influence for good which Primitive Methodism has exerted upon the people, as witnessed in the transformation of their character, and the elevation of their morals. Altogether the book is one of rare interest. The thorough heartiness of the writing, the *abandon* with which the author surrenders himself to it, is quite refreshing. Filey may be an "outlandish" place, a *terra incognita* to such men as the Leeds Railway functionary, spoken of in the preface; but to the author its every feature is familiar, and of absorbing interest; and it is proof of the ability and skill of his writing that he kindles a corresponding interest in the mind of the reader. We confess to our having felt the fascinating influence of his pen, and purpose when opportunity allows to visit and see for ourselves, "Filey and its Fishermen."

Primitive Methodism: a Sketch of the History, Doctrines, Polity, and Discipline of the Primitive Methodist Connexion. London: W. Lister, Sutton Street.

THIS is an admirable summary of the history and constitution of Primitive Methodism, the best, as we judge, that has yet issued from the press. How the author has been able to mass together so much information in such narrow compass, and in such clear and vigorous style, is something marvellous. The old story of Mow Hill and its associations is here narrated with fresh interest; the characteristic notices of the founders of the Connexion are pithy, pointed, and truthful; and the synopsis of doctrine, polity, and discipline is highly satisfactory.

Clayton versus *Mitchell, on Everlasting Retribution: or, Orthodoxy Vindicated.* By the Rev. ALFRED CLAYTON, Primitive Methodist Minister. London: W. Lister, Sutton Street.

IN the months of November and December, 1866, the Rev. W. Mitchell, Unitarian minister, delivered a series of lectures in the Temperance Hall, Leicester, against the orthodox doctrine of eternal retribution, which lectures were shortly afterwards published. Finding that these lectures were allowed to go unchallenged, and apprehensive that dishonour might thereby accrue to the true faith, as well as injury to the souls of men, the Rev. Alfred Clayton, then stationed at Leicester, published this somewhat elaborate tractate, in which, with no small share of intellectual accumen and logical force, the lectures are analysed, their arguments grappled with, and their sophistry laid bare. To persons troubled with doubt on the awful doctrine of future retribution we can heartily recommend the reading of this tractate.